

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCIV.]

DECEMBER, 1861.

[VOL. XVII.

MR. MACNAUGHT'S RESIGNATION OF HIS INCUMBENCY.

THE late Incumbent of St. Chrysostom's, Liverpool, is now a free man. He has taken the step which, to many observers from without, had long seemed to be inevitable. He has resigned his incumbency and become practically (if he cannot be also legally or ecclesiastically) a layman. Will any others of those clergymen who seem to outside observers to be similarly situated, feel it their duty to do the same?

Mr. Maenzaught, though not one of "the seven against Thebes," ranks as a "Broad-churchman" with the Essayists and Reviewers, with Mr. Maurice (their corrector, but himself heretical enough), with Mr. Llewellyn Davies and others still in the Church, and with Mr. Heath, now appealing from sentence of deprivation. He was first known to the public beyond Liverpool by his book on Inspiration, which was published early in 1856, and came to a second edition within six months after. This book is "An Inquiry concerning the Infallibility, Inspiration and Authority of Holy Writ,"—a bold and honest book for a clergyman to have written,—decisive against the absurd and mischievous, but still passively-received, notions of verbal inspiration,—but (perhaps we may think) rash and indiscriminating in some parts, and altogether missing the palpable distinction which is taken by reasonable believers between inspired *writings* and inspired *messengers*.* In his second edition, Mr. Macnaught virtually ranks himself among the conspicuous names above alluded to, by mentioning Jowett, Baden Powell, Rowland Williams and H. B. Wilson, as approving his book, and by referring to Maurice's Essay on the same subject.

Our readers may remember a recent incident that shewed the eye of his episcopal superior to be vigilantly set upon him. Mr. Wilson, of the Essays, having been announced to preach in St. Chrysostom's on a certain Sunday, the Bishop of Chester forbade the proceeding, and Mr. Macnaught was reduced to the alternative of preaching Mr. Wilson's sermons himself,—which sermons, however, proved most disappointingly free from heresy or naughtiness of any kind.

It was impossible that Mr. Macnaught's free speech and writ-

* In C. R., 1857, p. 329, Mr. Macnaught's work was noticed.

ing should escape the denunciation of his fellow-clergyman and fellow-townsman (do we rightly guess compatriot, too?), Dr. M'Neile, the Canon of Chester, the clerical adulator of "the Prince in his beauty." Last January, the Reverend Canon spoke a speech and preached a sermon on "the Infallible Authority of Holy Scripture," with pointed reference to Mr. Macnaught. The latter gave a public lecture in reply, politely inviting the Canon's presence, who, however, had not the courtesy to notice the invitation. In this lecture, Mr. Macnaught goes through the ungracious task of adducing scriptural difficulties and inconsistencies such as disprove Dr. M'Neile's platitudes, and shews that his opponent himself virtually, though grudgingly, admits his positions to be true, and that the infallibility of scripture, as asserted by the Canon of Chester, has reference, not to the English Bible, nor even to the critical Greek and Hebrew editions, but to the long-lost original manuscript of each scriptural writer! A theory plainly incapable of proof, but, if proved true, practically useless. And he rightly traces the growth of unbelief and scepticism, so constantly deplored by such preachers as Dr. M'Neile, to that clerical regime "which labours to stifle thought and repress truth."

Early in October last, Mr. Macnaught came to the conclusion that he could no longer honourably retain his position in the Church, as he was aware that it would be only through sufferance, "till the law reached him." He acted upon the resolution at once, and with great propriety and delicacy he abstained from even preaching a "farewell sermon," because he felt that he had no right to make explanations from a pulpit of the Establishment of theological views forbidden to clergymen.

His explanations were made in a letter of resignation, and again orally to a meeting of his late congregation, which was held in a school-room on the 17th October. His friends, having met there to frame an address to him, sent a deputation to request his presence; and after presenting their address, heard his explanations. It is from the newspaper reports of that meeting that we learn Mr. Macnaught's present theological position, and his views of his own religious duty and that of his friends.

In the following passage of his speech in reply to the address, he states his own heresies. The long involved sentence, interrupted by his own heart-comments on the objectionable creeds, and again by the sympathizing "cheers" of his audience, may stand just as it is, though the transposition of a few words would improve it to the reader. Probably it is just as it was spoken. We do not accuse the reporter, but praise the speaker, for its most admired disorder:

"But this thought came to me at last, that there is a position, there is an honour and a dignity, attached to the station of a Church-of-England clergyman—that there is an influence attached to that position;

and the question was whether, knowing, as I did, that if I put in black and white my opinions on several subjects—say, on whether right is wrong, whether sin is sin, and virtue virtue—or whether if I gave my opinion on the subject of the article which teaches that the heathen cannot be virtuous because he has not the grace of God in Christ—if I gave my opinion on that article and various articles—if I said what I thought of that expression in the confession in which we are taught to say, Sunday after Sunday, that there is no health in us! Good God! no health! No health of body! That is not the meaning obviously. No health of mind! Then where is memory that God has given us? Where is imagination? Where are judgment and reason that God has given? No health of soul! no health of heart! Then where is the parent's love of child? Where is the minister's love of his flock? Where is your love of your minister? Where is the general abhorrence of that which is recognized as evil, and love of that which is recognized as good? (Great cheering.) 'No health in us!' Never say those words again in the confession. Use the confession; use your Church liturgy; I mean to do so; but never say before God and man that which is a palpable falsehood. (Cheers.) I say that I yield to no man in loving the Church; but I felt that if I told out these things and many other things; if I put in black and white the sense in which I believed the expression about the three persons in one Godhead, which is a mere metaphysical employment of words after all; if I put out my thoughts about the resurrection of the body and the flesh,—I knew that the tenure of my office as a minister of the Church would just be good as long as the law would take to reach me, and no longer. Then the question arose for me, whether it was honourable and right for me to conceal these my opinions. I have not concealed them from you. (Hear, hear.) I have spoken almost all these things from the pulpit as it has seemed right to me; but when I had time to reflect upon it, I said, Shall I go on risking legal proceedings, which must end in defeat for me; or shall I say I don't believe any longer and assent and consent to all these things, and therefore I will resign?"

From these glowing words we may pretty well tabulate Mr. Macnaught's leading heresies. He may have others not mentioned here, but he plainly avows these four great human and humanizing, and surely we may say eminently Christian, heresies:

1. He believes that virtue is uniformly acceptable to God, even in unregenerate or heathen man, notwithstanding Articles 12, 13, 18, &c.

2. He repudiates the doctrine of original sin and utter depravity, in defiance of Articles 9, 11, 15, 17, and the general confession in the Liturgy.

3. He considers the doctrine of the Trinity to be a mere metaphysical employment of words, in spite of Articles 1, 2, 8, the Athanasian Creed, the invocations in the Litany and the perpetual Doxologies.

4. He seems to think that Article 4 is wise beyond what is written in declaring that Christ ascended with "his body, with flesh and bones," "into heaven and there sitteth;" and that the

Creed called the Apostles' has absurdly generalized the resurrection of Christ into a doctrine which modern science repudiates as the general law of human transition from mortality into life—"the resurrection of the body."

These form, certainly, a sufficient accumulation of rational beliefs and humane tendencies to warrant a man in feeling that he could only remain minister of the Church of England "as long as the law would take to reach him, and no longer."

The following account of his own ministry is such as befits *a free mind in a free position*. But in recommending "England's clergymen" to pursue the same method, he seems to forget that they may naturally fear the same results:

"You have spoken of my scorn for 'the doctrine of mental reservation;' I believe you have only done me justice in expressing it, for I have never kept anything as a reserved point when once plainly and clearly seen by me. (Hear, hear.) If you reflect for a moment, the secret of your remaining worshipers at St. Chrysostom's will be, that whatever changes there are in my views now from what they were nine years ago, they have been gradually avowed. You have never heard me, after six months' orthodox, so-called, preaching—stiff, old-fashioned preaching—you have never heard me, I say, suddenly give utterance to anything which was novel and striking; but as I have discovered, as I have felt, so week after week and month after month you have learned as gradually. (Cheers.) That has been the secret why ninety-nine out of a hundred are there still, after I published my book on Inspiration in the year 1854 or 1855. (Cheers.) If I might say words that could reach to England's clergymen, to whom I shall listen myself in the future, they would be these words—that coupled with this practice of telling you what I thought, has been another of never telling you what I did not understand myself. (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.) I have never talked mysteries to you; I have talked to you what I have first thought I felt myself; and if the clergymen who be-preach us will only do that, they will find it not only a source of power for themselves, but they will also find it a source of profit and advantage for us all."

We must now turn to the address of the congregation, and some of their accompanying expressions in presenting it.

We quote the address intire. It testifies to Mr. Macnaught's excellent character and earnest zeal. It shews a people ready to follow him wherever he might lead in the spirit of his ministry as thus far pursued :

"To the Rev. John Macnaught, M.A., Oxon, ex-Incumbent of St. Chrysostom's Church, in Everton, Liverpool.

"Reverend and dear Sir,—The intimation contained in your letter of the 30th of last month has taken us by surprise, and we can but imperfectly express the feelings it has excited in us.

"For nine years or more you have been our faithful pastor and friend. You have taught us of God, the soul and Christ. We have been guided by your wisdom and cheered by your sympathy.

"In losing the advantages of your ministry at St. Chrysostom's, we

feel that we do not merely lose your able and efficient instruction on all subjects of Christian thought and duty, but that, for ourselves and our families, we shall, if the separation must be complete, lose the friend who has not only been faithful to us in counsel, but has moved amongst us with the kindness and sympathy of a brother. In sickness, in sorrow and in trouble, you have been with us, in season and out of season, to soothe and cheer, to strengthen and guide, with genuine Christian affection.

"We know that you have been led to the decision you announce to us by the dictates of conscience, which you have taught us to obey even as the voice of God.

"Hard as it may be for you to speak the last parting word, we feel that it is at present impossible for us.

"We are affectionately attached to the Church of England; but we know that there have been periods in her history when 'too much stiffness in refusing' any 'variation' in her Liturgy has driven good and earnest men to seek, outside her pale, the means of worshiping with peace of mind and conscience, which they could no longer find within.

"It may be that such a period is now at hand. At all events, we too sadly know that the present resolute opposition to a revision of the Liturgy is productive of lamentable indifference and unbelief.

"We have good hope for the future of our Church. Of the 'times and the seasons' we presume not to know. But the Word of Him whose providence works by human means has taught us that, under His blessing, His ends may be wrought out by the self-denying wills of earnest and faithful men.

"Forgive us if we express a doubt whether, in your letter, you have defined our duty as clearly as you have seen your own. In a conventional sense it may be, as you indicate, harder to speak than to hear the unbelieved words which legislative authority thrusts upon our public worship.

"But bear with us if, our minds once opened, we cannot discover a substantial difference in this respect between teacher and taught. If it be wrong for the one habitually to stand at the desk, how can it be right for the other habitually to kneel on the floor? And how can we longer bear to hear from our children's lips words, many of which, to you and to us, have ceased to be true? Among other good things you have sown in our hearts, let us remind you of your scorn for the doctrine of mental reservation.

"Our duty scarce yet lies open and clear before us. But allow us to hesitate before we accept your assurance that the ties between us are finally broken.

"Whatever the future may have in store for you and us, we most sincerely join in your prayer that we may be ever found 'fighting on the side of truth, freedom, progress, Christ and God,' and with this sentiment we bid you heartily God-speed.

"Everton, Oct. 17, 1861."

"Your faithful friends."

Mr. Unwin (churchwarden) spoke in a manner worthy of a Dissenter and a man of science :

"You tell us, Sir, that your opinions have undergone a great change since you entered on the incumbency nine years ago. That a thinking

man should in that length of time see reasons for modifying his views is to us no matter for astonishment. The marvel would be that any man should consider himself called upon to cast anchor, as it were, on the formularies of our Church, drawn up three centuries ago, and to remain stationary when everything around him is moving onwards. Which of the schools of science demands of its disciples that their opinions shall never give way before the discoveries that are daily making inroads on past beliefs? We regret that the people of England should not recognize the difficulties that must beset the path of every thoughtful student amongst the English clergy; that they should not perceive the demoralizing effect of continuing to preach that which increasing knowledge has shewn to be no longer true. You tell us that you have candidly avowed every change of conviction as it has arisen. We are ready to bear testimony to the candour and disinterestedness of your motives in the course you have adopted, and that you have always honestly declared what appeared to you to be God's truth; otherwise why should you have been willing to bear the opposition and the obloquy which fell to your lot, and to suffer at this moment the loss of position, emoluments and friends? I ask, why suffer all this if not for conscience' sake? Yes, Sir, we are more than satisfied that you fulfilled the mission of an apostle of truth with Christian courage and with manliness. When any of us has in the course of his reading stumbled over some difficulty in reconciling a theological dogma with the facts of science, and came and asked for an explanation, you have not spurned it from you with an aspersion on his religious faith, but have either explained it or candidly admitted it to be inexplicable on the principle of prevailing exegesis. Thus, Sir, you have gained upon our affections, and won our entire confidence and esteem. You have ever made us feel that we were in the presence of a sympathizing brother, rather than in that of a priest, a lord over God's heritage. I trust that our fellow-countrymen, in common with the other peoples of Europe, are beginning to perceive that our religious liberty, at least, can only be secured by acknowledging that, whoever wrote the Bible, God alone made the world, and that therefore the book of nature cannot err, and that, if rightly read, its teachings must be God's truth, for, as it has been well said, every fact of nature is a word of God. Again, you say one thing is certain, that if you are to retain your self-respect, you must resign your ministry. However strong our wish to retain your ministrations in the Church may be, we would not, we could not, ask them at such a cost. I will now proceed to read the address which has been entrusted to me.—He then read the address given above."

A Mr. Taylor called Mr. Macnaught "the Luther of his time;" and Mr. James Birch (who, however, does not contemplate leaving the Church, but *reforming it by staying in it*) said:

"It is our consolation to know that the remembrance of his ministry amongst us will be that it has been a liberal and progressive ministry (hear, hear); that it has tended not only to elevate and to expand the thoughts of our minds, but likewise to purify and to strengthen the best emotions of our hearts. (Applause.) He has not only impressed upon us, through a long series of years, those moral and spiritual principles upon which all loving and practical Christianity must essentially depend,

but he has so held up those principles before us out of the living freshness of his own heart, that he has cleared them and separated them from those dry, old-fashioned dogmas which were only manufactured in ancient times by priests for the purpose of keeping mankind in bondage. (Loud applause.) You are aware, and I am sure every one now present in this assembly will vividly remember, how frequently he has impressed upon us that the religion which he taught contained but two essential principles—truth for the intellect and love for the heart (hear, hear); but in order that those two great principles may produce their full degree of impression upon the hearts and consciences of mankind, there must be one more essential condition, and that is, that they must be allowed to operate in a state of freedom. (Applause.) We are called upon, I think, to remember that he has so propounded to us the religion of Christ that, as men and as women, we may stand up before the world and say that we have such a religion in remembrance from his ministry that it makes us free—free to inquire into everything true and free to practise everything good. (Applause.)"

It is truly wonderful to find Churchmen enunciating with seeming unconsciousness of inconsistency those principles of free thought and progressive thought which have been hitherto regarded as characteristic of the freest-conditioned Dissenters alone, and have been uniformly reprobated by all Church authorities as inconsistent with articles, with subordination and with orthodoxy. It is wonderfully like the voice of the Protectionists proclaiming the achieved blessings of free trade, or of modern Conservatives talking Liberalism. The voice is Jacob's, if the hands are Esau's. But in matters ecclesiastical, as in economics and politics, the inconsistency is the evident tribute of the human mind and heart to truth and progress, given under circumstances of prejudice, habit, influence and interest, which strongly sway both mind and heart in the opposite direction. And here a sad compromise, as appears to us, begins. The mind repudiates the creeds of 300 years ago,—regards them as of no sort of authority over its free action,—thinks its own thoughts in the face of Nature and the Bible just as if they did not exist; but the heart lingers with Church associations and friendships,—the sentiment of national worship and a national Church asserts itself; and so it is hoped against hope that the national Church will reverse its intire system if we only wait quietly, avowing opinions in direct opposition to its Articles and Creeds, and shutting our ears or hearts or books to what we do not like in its worship.

It is clear from the laymen's address to their late pastor that they contemplated the probable necessity of secession from the Church. With plain English sense and feeling, they conclude that, if he can no longer minister under its forms, they ought no longer to worship under them. We repeat their words:

"In a conventional sense it may be, as you indicate, harder to speak than to hear the unbelieved words which legislative authority thrusts upon us. But bear with us if, our minds once opened, we cannot dis-

cover a substantial difference in this respect between teacher and taught. If it be wrong for the one habitually to stand at the desk, how can it be right for the other habitually to kneel on the floor? And how can we longer bear to hear from our children's lips words, many of which, to you and to us, have ceased to be true? Among other good things you have sown in our hearts, let us remind you of your scorn for the doctrine of mental reservation."

We confess ourselves grieved at Mr. Macnaught's reply to these high-minded words. Their Luther at once damps their zeal for active Protestantism. He earnestly intreats them to conform, as he means to do still himself as a layman among them:

"Now, after speaking of your affectionate attachment to the Church of England, you proceed to speak of the possibility of dissent from that Church,—of the possibility of a period of dissent being even now at hand. I implore you, I advise you, not to dissent; I advise and implore you to stay in your Church where you are (hear, hear), and to reform it, as Mr. Birch has said, by staying in it. (Hear, hear.) As to my present determination, I am on the future. I know not what I shall be to-morrow—I know not what I shall be in a week. I am looking, anxiously looking, as any of you might be looking, for employment. I know not what that future employment is to be; but whatever it may be, my present intention, as far as the laws of mediæval customs and Georgian enactments will admit, is to be a layman in the Church of England, and I advise you to remain the same. You ask me how you can do this? You ask, if it be wrong for the one (the clergyman) habitually to stand at the desk, how can it be right for the other (the layman) to kneel on the floor? I will point out to you two differences between the layman and the clergyman. The clergyman is obliged to use all the Prayer Book. He can't leave out even the words, 'there is no health in us.' You and I can; we are laymen. He must take up the Creed—some even think that they must take up the Athanasian Creed—and recite it from one end to another. He dare not get up and denounce it, or the passage, 'there is no health in us.' As laymen, we can abstain from using them. I sat with you and worshiped with you last Sunday, as, being in town, I will do again next Sunday; but when it came to repeating the Creed, even the Apostles' Creed, I paused and kept my lips significantly closed. If English laymen would only use that passive resistance to worn-out creeds, which contain many faults, it would not be long before a reformation of the Church Prayer Book must be brought about. Here is one difference, then, between the clergyman and the layman,—the clergyman must use every part of the service; you are not bound to do so. Nay, more, the clergyman is bound to assent and consent unfeignedly to all and everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer and in the service. Are you obliged? (No, no.) These, then, are two significant, and I maintain sufficient, differences between the position of a layman and that of a clergyman. I could no longer conscientiously retain the position of a clergyman; at present I see no difficulty in retaining the position of a layman. (Hear, hear.) That there are many faults, and important faults, in the Prayer Book, I feel as painfully as any of you. I feel a difficulty in letting my children recite those words that 'are for us no longer true; I feel the

difficulty in which we are placed; but it is a choice of evils, and in this world we must choose the lesser evil; and, as far as my little experience goes, there is no Nonconformist body in existence—and I see no likelihood of any Nonconformist body springing up—that will afford us the advantages for worship, and the opportunities and occasions for praying devoutly, which are afforded by the Church of England. (Hear, hear.) Therefore I take the Church of England, with all the difficulties and with all its faults, as the less alternative evil that I can get at. If the time should ever come when, in London or elsewhere, I should find a church, conformist or nonconformist, where I can worship more reasonably, and therefore more happily as well as piously, than in a less rational church, —to that church, where reason and piety are combined without so great inconvenience, I should go, and thither I should advise you, if you can find such, to go too."

"To reform the Church by staying in it," is the suggestion. By staying in it *as laymen*, that is to say; for he himself cannot be conscientiously a clergyman any longer. It is conceivable that the laity might reform the Church,—which the clergy are hardly likely to attempt (to the extent of freedom here contemplated, at least), for fear of imputation of heresy and deprivation of their benefices while under the unreformed system. It is conceivable that a wide and general demonstration by the laity of the Church of England (and the English laity more generally) of their disbelief in the doctrinal Articles of the Church, and, yet more, of their repudiation of its whole system of orthodoxy —its false and illiberal ethics of belief—might in course of time necessitate a sweeping reform. It is conceivable that the laity might set their clergy free to think and teach according to their progressive knowledge and belief, if they could agree to demand it at the doors of the Legislature, with that voice of thunder, growing louder and louder year by year, which claimed Reform for half a century and gained it in 1832; and which again, aided by famine and rebellion, gained freedom of bread in 1846. This is conceivable to us, *if* the united laity really wished for such a reform and chose to demand it. And it is an intelligible position to us (while holding what we feel to be a truer and freer position ourselves), that a lay Churchman who approves of a really national Establishment, should stay in the Church in order to reform it. Only, to justify his position, he had need be an *active* reformer. The analogy, far from exact, which Broad-churchmen draw between the born Englishman still holding to his native land, and the born Churchman to his Church, in spite of laws and customs that he disapproves, demands at least that the objecting and dissatisfied Churchman should be as active in his agitation for reform as the radical in polities.

But it is not thus that Mr. Macnaught proposes to his co-laymen to reform the Church. While attending forms of worship which they avowedly disapprove, he says: "*As laymen, we can abstain from using them.* I sat with you and worshiped with

you last Sunday; but when it came to repeating the creed, even the Apostles' Creed, I paused and kept my lips significantly closed." *Significantly closed* indeed! To whom was this act significant? To his fellow-worshipers? Do they look round at each other to see who repeats the creed and whose lips are significantly closed? Or was the significance designed for the officiating clergyman? By Mr. Macnaught's own showing, it signifies not to him. *He* must read it from the desk, but the people need not care for it on the floor. Was the significance intended for the Bishop of Chester, for the bench of Bishops, or the Convocation, or Parliament? The *significancy of silence* is precisely what will best satisfy all who now fear Church reform. It would not have signified what any of us thought, if nobody had become noisy, about Parliamentary reform or the cruel Corn-laws. *Quieta non movere*, is a maxim better understood by ecclesiastics even than by statesmen. No; the Church will never be reformed through the significant closing of the lips of the laity to its creeds or responses. In many fashionable churches and not a few quiet country places, the lips are generally closed; but it signifies nothing. How can Mr. Macnaught bring himself to believe that such a "passive resistance to worn-out creeds" would soon bring about a reformation of the Church Prayer-book? It is contrary to all experience in all reformations to think so. It is not indeed a passive resistance that he recommends, but a *passive assent*, if things have their right names. We grant, to a certain extent, the force of his distinction between the position of the clergyman and of the lay worshiper. We hold that the clergyman is not only bound *to read all*, but that by his act of subscription he is bound *to believe all*,—or that he who does not believe all "in the plain and full meaning thereof" has no right to sign the Articles and take orders. That few do so believe, and that the demand is a defiance of common sense, is in our view a strong argument for thorough Church reform, but no defence of broad or lax subscription. And by the same rule, applied in its due proportion and relation to the worshipers in a Church which has a precisely prescribed ritual implying those same Articles wherever their doctrinal meaning can be infused into its words of worship, we cannot but feel that those laymen were nobly right in expressing, in the touching words of their address, their sense of the general identity of their case with that of their pastor, rather than fancying a possible distinction. It remained for their pastor to point that minute distinction out to them, and to damp their readiness to confess for the truth under his lead.

We can hardly imagine that among all the Nonconformist churches in this country there should be none nearer to Mr. Macnaught than that Establishment from which he differs so very widely. But if this be indeed the case, the more need, we

should have thought, of his taking his faithful people with him, in thorough sympathy of belief and yet more of spirit, into a free church of their own. If he ascribes more power than we do to the protest of silence, he could hardly doubt that an active seceding protest would be yet more likely, especially if repeated (as it would be) in other places, to awaken the sluggish perception of the rulers of that Church, falsely styled National, which tyrannically imposes on the consciences of its ministers and people, and refuses (or thinks itself unable) to grant the reforms which are demanded by the progress of the world. Mr. Macnaught expresses a very strong opinion that the clergy in general are ready to welcome such reforms. By "not being worse than others," we presume he means not more freely thinking or widely differing in consequence. If his estimate is correct, the more need of an active protest on the part of all such men, and the nearer certainty of its success in procuring the thorough reform of the National Church itself. She can spare Mr. Macnaught, perhaps, and a few more; but she could not spare her best scholars and thinkers by hundreds. The laity would not allow her to do so, and to retain only the poorer minds that revolve contentedly within the orbit of her antiquated Articles.

"Now let no one leave this building with the idea that I stamp myself hereby as different from or worse than other clergymen. (Hear, hear.) There is a tendency in the minds of some people to rejoice over this my abandoning of the ministry of the English Church. People have a tendency in some quarters to say I must feel myself worse than other clergymen. Nothing of the sort! (Hear, hear.) Nothing of the sort! (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I don't believe that there is one clergyman in the Church of England but has changed his opinions, but has changed his faith, within the last ten years. (Hear, hear.) If he has taken up and read Neander's 'Church History'; if he has taken up and read Strauss's 'Life of Jesus'—and every clergyman ought to have read these two books; if he has taken up and read De Wette's 'Introduction to the Old and New Testament'; if he has taken up and read Bauer's 'Life of the Apostle Paul'—I am only naming four well-known books—and if he has read them with ordinary care and with average intelligence, he has changed his opinions, and changed them very much, within the last five or ten or fifteen years since he read those four books. (Hear, hear.) Well, now what is that man's position? His position is this. Ten years ago he said, 'I assent and unfeignedly consent to all and everything in the Book of Common Prayer.' He said it then in one sense, but to-day he says it in quite another sense. (Hear, hear.) I am casting no stone at his honesty. His conscience may give him leave still to take the same words in a constantly varying sense. My conscience will no longer allow me so to trifle with words (hear, hear); because if words are so to be tampered with, there is a danger lest honour and honesty in all matters of contracts and covenants in this country should be *nil*. If the clergy, the leaders and teachers of morality and spirituality, may use words in one sense to-day and understand by those same words something diametrically opposite and entirely different a short

time afterwards, what is to prevent a man entering into a contract in a given and understood sense between him and his fellow-men to-day, finding it inconvenient, unwise and inexpedient to carry it out in that understood sense three months afterwards, putting on those words an entirely different sense, an entirely changed meaning, when the wisdom of the first meaning has ceased? Now if I am to be a teacher of morality, I must be an example of honesty; and as soon as this conviction came upon me I could only retire from my ministry. There are other clergymen who feel the same difficulties that I have felt; but they persuade themselves that it is right to stifle inquiry and forget doubt. I say thus much in vindication of myself, and to prevent it being said that as a Broad-churchman and as a liberal I have stamped myself as worse than other clergymen. (Hear, hear.)"

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND A FRIENDLY CONTROVERSY ENSUING.*

IN C. R. for October, we translated from *Le Lien* of Aug. 31 the protest of twenty-one or twenty-two Genevese ministers against the narrowness of the Alliance, and the editor's remarks upon it. The editor, "in order (as he said) that our readers may fairly consider what it is proposed by the Evangelical Alliance to substitute for the gospel as the sign of union," quoted the Athanasian Creed in full as "the orthodox and authentic definition of the Trinity, such as is still read on certain feast-days in the service of certain Protestant churches and in all Catholic churches."

This gave offence in some quarters, and led to a very interesting controversy in *Le Lien*, as follows:

(*Sept. 28.*)

A REPLY AND A QUESTION.

There is scarcely an orthodox man remaining. Those who think themselves so are generally no such thing; and any one who shews them the real state of the case, has the misfortune of wounding them to the quick.

We had already understood from many quarters that our recent insertion of the Creed of St. Athanasius in our columns had produced a very lively impression. Orthodoxy is so little understood, in fact,—it envelopes itself in so much mist,—that when a ray of light penetrates into the midst of the darkness, it causes real grief. Of this we may judge by the vehemence with which M. Bersier complains, in the *Revue Chrétienne* (Sept. 15), of our having quoted the Athanasian Creed:

"The Evangelical Alliance is exposed to the attacks of the party who would establish religious union on an absolute indifference as to matters of faith. This party cannot forgive it for

* Continued from p. 682.

believing that Christian doctrines still remain, and for proclaiming them; we profess that the tactics employed by them to discredit the Alliance seem to us coarse enough. In 1855, after the meetings of the Alliance in Paris, one of the chief representatives of the party of which we speak horrified a whole assembly at a public meeting, by attacking the doctrine of the damnation of infants in their mothers' wombs, and by giving out that this was one of the doctrines of orthodoxy. He knew very well all the time that none of the members of the Alliance would have acknowledged that doctrine; but the mode adopted was dramatic and successful. This year, too, we meet with exactly similar proceedings in the polemics of the same party. The Alliance declared its faith in God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Forthwith the *Lien* bethinks itself to present to its readers the Athanasian formulary of the Trinity, asking them whether that is their belief,—certainly a convenient procedure, but one which we cannot help thinking far from delicate, as the *Lien* knows very well that the question had nothing to do with Athanasius or his formularies."

No, not with Athanasius. But had it not to do with the Athanasian Trinity? It must be plainly asked, Are there two doctrines of the Trinity? And if there are two, which does the Evangelical Alliance adopt?

It would be easy enough to retort on M. Bersier the accusation of *indelicacy* and *coarse tactics* which he applies to us. Can M. Bersier in truth and coolness aver that the men whom he attacks have ever preached or taught or approved "*utter indifference in matters of faith*"? It is, on the contrary, because these men have convictions of their own—because they have dedicated their lives to defending and propagating them—because they are the very reverse of indifferent whether to what they affirm or deny—that M. Bersier and others maintain so warm a warfare against them. We should therefore be perfectly justified in accusing M. Bersier on our part, and applying to him, as just and well-founded, the vague and unjust accusation which he raises against us. But we prefer being more polite and Christian, and seeing in these grave imputations narrowness and passion rather than anything else. This is, however, we confess, the most indulgent judgment we can pass upon them.

What! are we not intitled to tell our churches (who do not know it) what the doctrine of the Trinity is? Not intitled to do this, at the very moment when this doctrine seems to be chosen by the Evangelical Alliance as its flag—that Alliance, offensive and defensive, of the orthodox of every country and every church?

Let us not lose sight of the point in discussion. Those who organized the meeting of *Christians* of every nation convoked at Geneva, in a circular which caused a strong sensation, invited

none but the adherents of the doctrine of the Trinity. And it was unfair on our part to let our readers know what that doctrine is? It was unfair to shew them, by a complete and exact quotation of the official document admitted by all Roman Catholics, orthodox Greeks and orthodox Protestants, to the present day, as an authority fully recognized and not disavowed by any of them?

Is it, then, necessary or useful to any party not to know very exactly what this doctrine really is? Can there be some portion of the Trinitarians who are only such in appearance? Has the Evangelical Alliance admitted into its bosom some persons of seeming orthodoxy who take the name without admitting the thought? Some *Sabellians*, for instance,—that is, theologians who see in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, not three persons, but three manifestations of one and the same Person?

In that case, it would be our place to be indignant and to deplore such a culpable equivocation. Either be orthodox and believe in the Creed of St. Athanasius, or say aloud that you do not believe in it, and give up an orthodox pretension which would cease to be candid.

Once more: we liberals, we heterodox people, have the right to differ among ourselves; we do not at all pretend to be all of one mind. We think the saving faith is the individual faith. We are truly individualists, and more consistent individualists than *Vinet*.

But you, who have separated from our Church, because, among other reasons, it is not homogeneous, but includes heterodox persons,—who in your journals are demanding that the Reformed Church of France shall reject and renounce us because we are not orthodox,—you are at least bound to be orthodox yourselves, otherwise you are self-confuted and self-condemned.

In fact, you are not orthodox. That you think you are and wish to be so, I cannot doubt; but you deceive yourselves. The Athanasian Creed begins with these words: “Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith.” That is the principle of orthodoxy. That is what is still read from the desk in the Anglican Church on feast-days. That is what your conscience (we congratulate you on the fact) more or less plainly disapproves. There is, when we come to it, something that does you honour in your anger at our quotations from the most famous of orthodox symbols. You have felt the goad, and this one fact shews you to be animated by a generous ardour. But it also shews how the position of well-informed orthodox persons is becoming daily more difficult and more fallacious. The orthodox man who knows nothing, is at peace. He who thinks and knows and wishes to remain orthodox, is greatly to be pitied: he is aiming at an impossibility.

Why does M. Bersier make it an accusation against a preacher

to have quoted in the pulpit that article of the Rochelle Confession of Faith which, in consequence of original sin, damns little children from before their birth? Does this article exist or not? It is avowed that the Rochelle Confession of Faith is not obsolete, abolished or effaced. A whole party writes and preaches that it exists, that it is in vigorous action, and that all who oppose it are intruders in the Church. But that party quotes it very rarely, for a good reason. As soon as any one dares to make known what it contains, the same party complain of being calumniated.

Orthodoxy can subsist no longer except on condition of wrapping itself up in the vagueness of conventional phrases or undefined terms. We shall not allow it this resource; but whenever it shall conceal itself behind a cloud, we shall drag it out by quoting its books of articles, its official declarations: we shall quote them very exactly and at full length, as we did with that inextricable chaos of contradictory words which has been called, whether from Athanasius's time or that of Vigilius of Tapsa, the doctrine of the Trinity. This is the part of a thoroughly fair and frank opponent; it is an honourable contest with open visor, which no one can find fault with unless to denounce himself.

We have rendered our cordial tribute to the liberal intentions and the remarkable progress shewn by the directors of the *Revue Chrétienne*. But, through regard to them, we have perhaps not sufficiently expressed how much they seem to us to deserve compassion in their false position,—half heterodox in mind, but orthodox *de facto*, in point of habit and inclination, and bound to defend the whole of orthodoxy, while they inculcate only a part of it.

But when they attack us without measure or propriety,—when they impute to us unfair intentions, and that merely for having, in 1855 and 1861, quoted the official documents on which orthodoxy rests, they compel us to speak all our mind.

What we ask of them is, to tell us all theirs. We cite our accuser at once, and ask him the following very simple question:

In speaking of a vast assemblage who had announced that at the opening of each of their sittings there would be read a summary declaration of faith, in which the doctrine of the Trinity was professed without being defined, we reprinted the official formulary of that doctrine. You say that we did wrong. Be so good as to give us the means of rectifying our mistake. What do you say is the orthodox formulary of the doctrine of the Trinity? We do not ask you to be clear; that is, we suppose, quite impossible on this subject; but be precise, like the Athanasian Creed which you repudiate. It is only too precise; and it is that quality especially that makes it unacceptable to us, to many others, and perhaps to yourself.

*(From *Le Lien*, Oct. 12.)***A PEACEFUL CONTROVERSY.**

Paris, Oct. 1, 1861.

MR. EDITOR,—Your last number contains a question addressed to me; you appeal directly to me, and in a manner summon me to reply. I will do so now; and since you require from me precision and frankness above all, I will endeavour to leave you nothing to desire on this score.

First, let us agree to censure my unguardedness (*les vivacités*) of language in the article which has provoked your observations. Such inadvertences of hasty editing, I am the first to regret. I will do my best to let no more such escape my pen.

What is the question between us? A question of fact, which I will now reduce to its simplest expression. The Evangelical Alliance proclaimed its faith in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, the living and true God. Thereupon, you reprint at full length the Creed called Athanasius's, and you add: "This is what, according to St. Athanasius, must be believed in order to be saved; and according to the Evangelical Alliance, in order to be member of that body."

Well, Sir! I affirm that you have no right to say that. The Evangelical Alliance has never adopted the Athanasian Creed; you have no right to say that this Creed is its flag, no more than you would have a right to say that, on the subject of the Atonement, it has adopted the formula of Saint Anselm. I called your procedure *indelicate*; I withdraw the word, but the thing surprises and grieves me.

Judge a religious society by its professed principles, and do not ask a father of the fourth century to explain to you what the Evangelical Alliance believes.

You ask me, Sir, my personal opinion on the Trinity. I do not quite see of what importance it can be in this discussion, but as I have no reason for suppressing it, you shall have it in two words:

I find the fact of the Trinity in scripture, for I see the divine attributes applied in turn to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; I believe in the well-accustomed (*solemn*) meaning of the Trinitarian phraseology by which we have all been dedicated in baptism. Moreover, as far back as I can penetrate in the history of the Church, long before Athanasius, I find the honours of divinity paid to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.* As to the formulare called Athanasius's Creed, I do not adopt it unreservedly, and the principal fault I find with it is, that it goes beyond revelation in wishing to define what is undefinable.

Must I remind you that between Christian facts and human formularies, there is the whole distance that separates religion

* See particularly Bunsen's *Ante-Nicæana*.

from theology? You know this, Sir, as well as I. Well, then, what pleases me in the Alliance profession of faith is, that it rests on the ground of facts and worship.

Is this, Sir, equivalent to saying that, finding the Trinity in scripture, everything in that doctrine appears to me luminous and simple? No, indeed! I confess that in it I meet with great obscurities and even with logical contradictions. But I have long since perceived that all the doctrines of Christianity, beginning with the most elementary, that of the creation, present insurmountable difficulties to pure reason. I have come to the conclusion that mere logic is insufficient to solve the religious problem, and that two things may both be true, though they appear to me contradictory. This rule seems to me indispensable in questions which touch upon the relations of the finite and the infinite. You may thus understand, Sir, how astonished I am to see an intelligent man like you triumphantly calling the Trinity *an inextricable chaos of verbal contradictions*. Did you never suspect that you might be confronted with the same disdain and the same words, whenever you speak of creation, of the personal God, or of moral liberty?

Yes, the doctrine of the Trinity is obscure; but I ought to expect that; it relates to the very nature of God. It would be strange if I could grasp the Infinite in my hand. But, obscure as it may be, it has luminous sides which enlighten my soul, and without which Christianity is inexplicable to me. I shall only bring forward one; that is, the divinity of the Son. In my view, it is the doctrine of doctrines: Christianity, without the incarnate Word, is a philosophy, but has ceased to be a religion. What am I saying? Without it, I cease to understand Jesus himself; if the Christ is not God, his teaching is false and his apostles are idolaters.

This, Sir, is what I may call the popular and practical side of the doctrine of the Trinity. It is probable that, if you had read the Athanasian Creed to the immense majority of Christians assembled at Geneva, they would have replied that they had nothing to do with it; but if you had asked them what they thought of Christ, they would have replied that they worship him as their God.

Permit me, on this subject, to submit to you, in my turn, a simple question; for I quite approve your desire to bring our theology out of the clouds in which it would wrap itself:

Is Jesus Christ the Son of God, or is he the Son of Joseph? If he is the Son of God, are we idolaters for worshiping him with the universal Church?

That is my question. Be so good, in your turn, I pray you, as to reply to it without circumlocution and with all possible precision.

Shall I venture to express one thought more in conclusion?
VOL. XVII.

You pity us for being orthodox. Our position seems to you desperate. I am at ease in this respect, because I know that the Christianity which we wish to preserve is eternal. But you who pity us, do you consider your peculiar position so enviable? For my part, I cannot think of it without concern. Consider, Sir. There are some, now-a-days, who say that miracle is impossible; that the resurrection of Jesus is a myth; that his moral character is not beyond suspicion; that the existence of a personal God is a fact open to discussion: and against these men you would not have the pulpit closed; you lend them the safeguard of your talent, your character, your piety; you accept their adhesion without scruple, and with their aid you form what you call the liberal party. You, Sir, call this serving Christianity. But, for myself, I ask you, with bitter sorrow, if this is the conduct of the defenders of the gospel, what shall be that of its enemies?

With the greatest respect, I am, Sir, yours,

EUGENE BERSIER.

I.

In the act of defending himself against our assertions, the author of the above remarkable letter confirms and justifies them to our view.

What was it we had really said? That scarcely any orthodox persons remain; that those who still claim to be so, and who exclude the heterodox from the Church, are themselves heterodox; that one has but to bring before their eyes the official documents of orthodoxy, to distress them in the very position in which they entrench themselves, and from which they pronounced condemnation on those who do not think as they do.

The Evangelical Alliance having supplied the place of its first invitation, addressed to any one who "loves Jesus with a pure heart," by an appeal to Trinitarians only, but not having defined what it means by Trinity, we said it for her, by reproducing in our columns the authentic document on the subject, which is admitted as such by the whole orthodox world, Catholic, Greek, Anglican, Lutheran and Reformed,—the Creed called that of St. Athanasius. This mere quotation produced, in some minds, the effect of one of those cannon-shots which disperse a thick fog in the twinkling of an eye. It was only too clearly seen what the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity is.

M. Bersier was moved by it; and in an article in the *Revue Chrétienne*, written hastily under the impulse of somewhat warm prepossession, he blamed us very severely (and he blames us still) for having, as he cleverly says, asked a father of the fourth century the opinions of the Evangelical Alliance in 1861.

What does this mean? Has the doctrine of the Trinity, then, changed? The thousand pastors who met at Geneva, had they heard us read to them the Athanasian Creed, would have told us

that *they had nothing to do with it!* (*n'y entendaient rien*). And M. Bersier himself declares that *he does not accept it without reserve!*

Hence we conclude that M. Bersier is not orthodox; and that, according to him, the thousand pastors gathered by the Evangelical Alliance are no more orthodox than he.

What is the Athanasian Creed? It is the declaration of *what must be believed with the heart and confessed with the lips by whoever will be saved*; and the second passage of this document is, *Whoever shall not keep this faith whole and inviolable, shall without doubt perish everlasting*ly. This symbol, in the Anglican Church, forms part of the Liturgy of the four great feasts and of seven less solemn ones (a fact which, to our knowledge, has prevented very pious and enlightened persons from communicating on those days). Luther wrote in reference to this Creed: "It is drawn up in such a manner that I doubt whether, since the time of the apostles, anything more important and excellent (*etwas Wichtigeres und Herrlicheres*) has been written in the Church of the New Covenant." Nor has this symbol ever been officially disclaimed by any of the great orthodox Churches.

It has continued to bear sway, especially on the doctrine of the Trinity. And unless orthodoxy is an unmeaning word, a pretension without reality or aim, those of us who are not Trinitarians have full right to say to our contemporaries, You are required to believe in the Trinity; you do not know what it is; *here* is the Trinity according to the most orthodox pattern.

We have a right to add, that for many ages the orthodox Churches of England, and those of Luther and Calvin, would have rejected M. Bersier from their embrace, if only for the letter above quoted: they would have excommunicated him, and have declared that he is condemned, like us, to perish everlasting. That is a fact admitting of no denial.

Why, then, does he profess himself orthodox? And why is he exclusive? Why does he exclude us, Anti-trinitarians, from his Church or from the Evangelical Alliance, if not from eternal salvation too, in the name of an orthodoxy which he himself *cannot accept without reserve?*

That is an inconsistency to be deeply regretted. It is having two weights and two measures. If you choose to *make reservations*,—if you allow yourself to differ from your masters,—if you think it absurd that a father of the fourth century, or rather a document of the seventh, should be consulted in 1861 for what orthodox people believe,—if you dare to think and know for yourself,—why, then, break with orthodoxy; tear away those links of the chain that remain riveted to your feet, and the clank of which betrays the slave not wholly emancipated from human formularies. Since you are at heart heterodox, be so outwardly. Dare to see yourself as you really are.

II.

Apropos to this subject, we may cite against our opponent an unexpected ally. By a very curious coincidence, the last No. of the *Esperance* contains an article by Pastor Grand Pierre on the doctrine of the Trinity. That article is a refutation of the doctrines of the *Revue Chrétienne* on the subject. It attacks a work of Pastor E. Arnaud (Aug. 1861), as well as some other papers by M. de Pressensé and a third contributor to the *Revue Chrétienne*. M. Grand Pierre intitles his refutation—*Is the Son subordinate to the Father?*

He endeavours to prove the negative, and he affirms that the New Testament is of his opinion. He discusses various passages of scripture in reference to the subject. He attempts to prove, for instance, that when Jesus said, *My Father is greater than I*, he was only speaking of himself *as he was in this world*. He affirms that it is a mistake to believe that St. Paul placed the Son beneath the Father when he wrote—“*I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God.*” And lastly, by an inconceivable subtlety of thought, he comes to deny that Paul teaches the subordination of the Son to the Father when he writes—“*When all things shall be subdued unto the Son, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*”

In all this, M. Grand Pierre seems to us to defy evidence, and to force the very clear texts which he cites into saying the very opposite to what they really say with great precision and force. Then the same theologian, imitating, no doubt unconsciously, the fathers of the early councils, who ended by decreeing to Mary the title of *Mother of God*, inveighs against *those who shall have haggled about the divinity of the Saviour's person or his passion and the sacrifice of his cross: he predicts that it will not be they who, in the day of the Lord, will with the greatest joy and eagerness cast their crowns at the foot of the throne of God and the Lamb.* Still he does not consign them to perdition; he is far from doing so, as it is easy to see; and this again proves to us that orthodox manners have become softened. God be praised for it!

But orthodox doctrine has remained unchanged. M. Grand Pierre is, we think, perfectly right in his logic, though his theory seems to us, and perhaps to M. Bersier too, essentially false and indefensible. He is orthodox, which M. Bersier is not.

We should congratulate the latter most heartily if he recognized the fact, and if, being himself excluded from orthodoxy, he did not attempt to exclude others in the very name of orthodoxy.

Either orthodoxy is something immovable, settled, cut and

dried, or it is nothing. Either M. Bersier is in agreement, as to the fundamental dogmas, the characteristic doctrines of orthodoxy, with M. Grand Pierre and the Athanasian Creed, or else he is heterodox. Well; he does not accept without reserve the authority of the Creed, and M. Grand Pierre contests his doctrine and that of the *Revue Chrétienne* on behalf of orthodoxy. It is therefore doubly proved that M. Bersier and his Review are heterodox. When will they cease to be exclusive?

Would to God that it were so now, and that I were wrong in thinking the *Revue Chrétienne* and its editors exclusive! But nothing as yet authorizes such a hope; and I much fear that, if they were to declare themselves the friends of toleration and consistent disciples of free inquiry, M. Grand Pierre's journal would no longer regard them as worthy to cast their crowns, even with less eagerness and joy than others, at the foot of the throne of the Lamb and of God.

III.

It remains for me to reply to the questions addressed to me by my opponent. I shall do so with perfect openness.

But, first, I wish to point out to him the difference of our positions in this respect. I asked him, as one who calls himself orthodox and shews himself exclusive, though denying the *Quicunque Vult*—and I had a right to ask him—this question: If you have ceased to be Trinitarian by the standard of the orthodox of all times, by right of what dogma is it that you are still exclusive? By what right do you, who are heterodox in fact, exclude me who am avowedly heterodox? It was in this sense that I challenged him; and he does very wrong to ask of *what importance his personal opinion can be in the discussion*; because, being unable to exclude me on the authority of that general orthodox opinion which he does not share, he excludes me, it is plain, on the authority of his own personal opinion. I asked him, By virtue of what law do you condemn me? and he replies by setting forth a mitigated orthodoxy which is rejected by the true orthodox.

As for me, who do not presume to condemn any one, it is simply about a personal opinion that he questions me, and not about an exclusive law to which, as having been applied to him, he might be intitled to call others to account.

Our respective positions being thus clearly settled, I very willingly reply, on my own personal responsibility, to the three questions put by M. Bersier.

His first question is this: *Is Jesus the Son of God, or is he the Son of Joseph?*

In my opinion, he is the Son of God; and I am not one of those who are quite satisfied with the simply humanitarian hypo-

thesis and the absolute denial of the supernatural: * I believe that the question of the supernatural rests at last upon a mis-understanding, and that the distinction, apparently so marked, between natural and supernatural, is in its ultimate analysis equivocal and illusory.

I do not mean to say, however, that I fail to recognize the legendary element which evidently intervenes in certain places in the history of the Saviour and in many other parts of scripture. . So M. Bersier's first question is essentially ill put. For Jesus might be at once the Son of Joseph and the Son of God. St. John the Evangelist certainly believed him to be the Son of God; yet he calls him the Son of Joseph; he puts that name into the mouth of another apostle (John i. 45); and in the same record (the history of Nathanael), these two titles, Son of Joseph and Son of God, are given to Jesus, within a few verses, without any perception on the part of the sacred writer that they are inconsistent. If M. Bersier's question had been put to the fourth evangelist, he would have answered—Jesus Christ is both the one and the other. No mention whatever is made in St. John's Gospel of the miraculous birth.

It is plain to me that Jesus produced on his hearers a perfectly unique impression, and that they saw in him a serenity, a dignity, a wisdom, a purity, that were altogether divine. There stands the fact—the divine in Jesus. They were convinced of his super-human grandeur by their own experience in their intercourse with him. This impression is reproduced in our own day upon the readers of the words and acts of Jesus Christ. I experience it myself, and that often. But how is *the divine in Jesus Christ* explained? In various ways; and the New Testament contains more than one theory on this subject, which offer themselves sometimes singly, sometimes in various combinations. In my view, the essential fact, anterior to these theories and alone important in practical Christianity—alone operative upon the mind, the conscience and the heart of believers—is, the divine in Jesus. I believe in it fully, without having succeeded as yet in satisfying myself what I must take or leave of those different explanations which M. Bersier seems to confound together in one, namely, the miraculous birth. So far as I am concerned, that is a question for further study; and though I foresee that it will not in my case result in a thoroughly orthodox explanation, I have at

* The readers of the C. R. will wonder to see these two ideas put together as naturally connected. In England, the humanitarian hypothesis, as to the nature or person of the Saviour, is held with full belief in his supernatural endowments. Nor, perhaps, will M. Coquerel's idea of the identity of the natural and supernatural, *in their ultimate analysis*, satisfy most of our readers. It was advocated some years since by Mr. Furness, of Philadelphia. A writer in the National Review for October, 1861 (p. 416), has clearly distinguished between the natural and the supernatural, which other writers in the same Review have, however, too often confounded.

present no precise solution to give. I confess, moreover, that the problem is not, in my view, of first importance, and that others of a more practical kind fill my thoughts much more.

This answer of mine, like that of M. Bersier on his theory of the Trinity, is not perfectly final. But, like him, I give it as the best I have. I do not pretend to explain beyond what I understand; and, as a heterodox man, I am fully intitled to say so.

Only I affirm that the essential point is neither the miraculous birth, nor the pre-existence and incarnation of the Word, nor the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus at the moment of his baptism; but *the divine in him*. And I affirm that a man may be a very good and true Christian in heart, conscience and faith, even without believing these points, which are in my view secondary. I would on no account have excluded the apostle Philip from the Church, nor from the communion, for having said that Jesus was the Son of Joseph; nor St. John for having repeated and written it without correction. It seems that M. Bersier, heterodox as he appears to us, would do otherwise. Neither Philip nor the apostle of the *Word* believes the divinity of Jesus Christ so as to satisfy him.

The second question is this: *If he is the Son of God, are we idolaters for worshiping him with the universal Church?*

First of all, what is the propriety of invoking the universal Church in this question? M. Bersier does not include in it the Unitarians, the Socinians and many others who do not worship Jesus Christ. But, on the other hand, he might include Arius, who always declared himself a worshiper of Jesus Christ. But he plainly means, by the universal Church, only the orthodox Church. What a strange abuse of words! And by what right does he talk of the universal orthodox Church, when he separates himself from it as to the authority of the Athanasian Creed?

Where has he seen it recorded that the apostles worshiped Jesus Christ, as he says in one part of his letter? It is, on the contrary, very remarkable that, possessed as, sooner or later, they were with the divine ascendancy of their Master, they never worshiped him. They did not even feel tempted to do so. Besides, Jesus would not have allowed it for a moment,—Jesus who refused even to be called *good*, and reserved that title in its simplicity for his Father only,—Jesus who never ceased to call our God his God, and to worship and pray to Him himself. Jesus might and did rightly insist continually upon his own intimate union with the Father, and appeal to Him continually as the source of his instructions and his authority; and he had no need to fear that the Israelites, monotheists as they were in heart and conviction, by habit and descent, would offer him worship.

Unfortunately, the new element introduced into the Church by the conversion of the Gentile world, did not bring into it the

same purity and rigour of monotheism; and Jesus Christ was soon worshiped (by Alexander Severus, for instance) on the footing of heroes and demi-gods, and on a still higher scale. At length that sad and paltry prejudice diffused itself which we still find in the above-quoted article in the *Esperance*; according to which a man ought, “*without haggling*,”—that is to say (as it would seem), without thoroughly examining what he does,—to decree to Christ the titles of co- eternal, consubstantial and absolutely equal with the Father (though the gospel and conscience and common sense forbid). To make this Christ, whom the gospel presents to us so truly humble, so full of heaven and God, into a being who is jealous of his dignities,—to threaten with his wrath those who “*haggle*” about his absolute deity,—is to have ill-understood him; it is to shew little elevation or spirituality of thought; it is to misunderstand the charity and holiness of the Son.

No, you are not idolaters, even if you worship Jesus. You are only inconsistent. Idolatry—the worship of idols—has nothing to do with your mistake. Here again is an ill-put question. You mean to ask, Are we polytheists in worshiping the Son and the Father? Oh, no; certainly not; since your reason for worshiping both is, that you confound them together as one God. You are neither idolaters nor polytheists; you are wanderers in a sea of contradictions. You are here beyond the bounds of common sense; and there are no intelligible terms by which exactly to define your illusion, which is self-condemned and self-refuted.

We do not at all dispute what M. Bersier admirably says on the impossibility which the human mind may experience of reconciling together two truths equally proved. It is what Vinet called an *irreducible duality* (*dualité irréductible*), and it is long since Bossuet laid it down as a rule of his logic, “Never to abandon truths once known, whatever difficulties may supervene in trying to reconcile them; but still to hold fast the two ends of the chain, though you cannot always see the middle where the links are joined continuously.”

But this is one of those grand rules (*règles héroïques*), the application of which requires the most scrupulous prudence. For, unless we erect into a general principle the *credo quia absurdum*, we neither can nor ought to renounce the obligation of mutually counterpoising the different notions which we accept as proved, and which, if true, are inherent parts of one and the same whole. By applying such a principle needlessly, we should be depriving belief of all foundation; we should be solemnly promulgating the legitimacy of un-reason. No doubt, Creation, the Personality of God, Free-will, offer difficulties to human logic. But in those difficulties, the two terms hard to reconcile are, to my view, truths established on solid foundations,

and those two terms have, in my view, a right to hold their place; whereas the Trinity is an arbitrary and useless hypothesis, an explanation that explains nothing and complicates everything, a contradictory and needless division of that which is essentially One and Infinite.

It seems plain to us that the author to whom the name of St. Athanasius is given, has transgressed those wise limits (and M. Bersier agrees with us, for he very justly accuses him of wishing to define the indefinable); but we think he shares this fault with all Trinitarians.

We, too, attach a well-accustomed sense to the baptismal formulæ. We, too, believe in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit,—in the Father, as the Creator and Preserver of all things; in Jesus Christ, his Son, as our Redeemer; and, as the Son renewed, revealed and inaugurated the normal and intimate relation of our souls with the Spirit of God, the direct and inward agency of God in us, we believe in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is that divine agency in us; it is God working in our consciences.

It is not a distinct being from the Father, but it is a normal relation of the Father with his children, re-established and renewed by the Son.

If it be replied that in this faith there is less symmetry than in the doctrine of the Trinity, I shall readily grant it; and it would be easy for me to prove that this artificial and false symmetry afterwards introduced was what led to the adoption of the dogma of the Son's equality with the Father, to the designation of Mary as Mother of God, and to that worship of the Virgin which has gradually arrived at the monstrous position in which we see it ever since the decree of the reigning Pope. It was in order to prove that they did not *haggle* about ascribing divine attributes to Jesus, that the Council of Ephesus, in 431, definitively decreed to his mother the blasphemous title, "Mother of God."

The original want of symmetry presented by the baptismal formula, when taken in its real and primitive sense, is perfectly conformable to the nature of things. It is also agreeable to the intellectual characteristics of the country and language of Jesus and the apostles. There are in the Bible analogous instances of an almost symmetrical enumeration of elements which are nevertheless very different and unequal (for instance, 1 Kings xxi. 9). The taste of the Hebrews for parallelisms, and the absence among them of the cold precision of western thought, made them fond of those expressive enumerations which, without demanding a very rigid symmetry, included different beings or facts (as it were) in one frame.

The third question is, *Whether our own position in the Church and in theology seems to us enviable?*

Yes; in spite of its difficulties and dangers, confronted as it is with the system of exclusion. Yes; because it is quite sincere. We do not in any way aim at being orthodox. We are heterodox, heretical, individual, liberal. Little do these names signify to us. We accept them and avow them. We believe that our Christianity is the good and true sort, that of the gospel and of Jesus Christ; we believe that the Reformation is involved in primitive Christianity; and we believe that the Reformation is perpetual. Our programme consists of two words, **GOSPEL** and **LIBERTY**,—that gospel which from beginning to end is full of Jesus Christ's person and word, of his life and promises,—the gospel, together with the right (rather the strict obligation) to interpret it according to our own conscience, with all the lights that God gives us,—the gospel, in which we are sure to find, for instance, the sublimest of all histories, and also traces of legend—sure to see instructions that are eternally true, and also the imprint of mistakes belonging to the times when the sacred books were written,—the gospel, coupled with the absolute duty of examining everything, discussing everything, “proving all things,” so as to assimilate everything good and avoid everything that is not.

Consequently, the men of faith whom M. Bersier reproaches me for not excluding are my brethren and fellow-workers. It may be that, in this period of transition, when we are all in search of *a method*,—when the formulary of doctrines has to be made afresh,—when Christianity is separating itself from the clouds of the past to come forth purer and stronger,—it may be that my friends or myself may have been led occasionally too far; it may be that doubts have been raised without sufficient reason on one point or another. But this mistake is simply the fallibility of every human being; and, moreover, a disputed truth brought into full daylight by discussion, cannot fail to come forth brighter and more efficacious. Those who labour to purify faith, and to place Christianity on the ground of individual conscience alone, freeing it from the useless and worm-eaten props applied to it by an unenlightened theology, are the men who are working the work of God.

How can we doubt that God will, in our days, under our eyes and by our hands, transform and renew the religious world? He employs two classes of workers,—those who know what they are doing under the impulse of his Spirit, and those who do not know. But all are working for Him,—Pius IX. and Cardinal Antonelli, by maintaining against all evidence the infallibility of Rome and the necessity of its temporal power; Father Passaglia, by proving that the temporal power is no doctrine of the Church; Father Gavazzi, by throwing about the living germs of the Reformation at Naples; the journal *L'Esperance*, by setting genuine orthodoxy up again, in opposition to the *Revue Chrétienne*, yet

without consigning its adversaries to perdition, but satisfied with lessening their share of *exultation and joy in heaven*; M. Bersier, by repudiating the principal symbol of orthodoxy; we and our friends, by repudiating the very idea of orthodoxy and demanding only these two things, *the Gospel and Liberty*.*

Only, among all these workers for God, these architects of the future, there are some who do their work in spite of themselves, and who even think, perhaps, that they are doing the very reverse. Others are half conscious of what they are doing, and pull down with one hand what they build with the other. The only men who seem to us to be fully conscious of their mission, are the liberal, the individualistic, the heterodox. For this reason, we cannot condemn or exclude them. For this reason, on the contrary, our duty and our conviction place us in their ranks.

We regret the illusion which keeps at a distance from them such distinguished men as M. Bersier and the editors of the *Revue Chrétienne*; and it is with real sympathy that we grieve to see them self-deceived as to their own position in the Church.

Heterodox as you are in heart, be so in spirit too. We said just now, Dare to see what you are; let us further say, Dare to see what you are doing. You are working for us; you are modifying the immutable thing called orthodoxy; you are applying restrictions to it. Henceforth, orthodox infallibility has ceased. You yourselves have sapped the basis of the dogmatic tribunal from which you still launch your anathemas against the heterodoxy which invades you on all sides.

ATH. COQUEREL, Jun.

SLAVERY.

BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

CAN a vast interest veil a monstrous crime
And make it like a virtue? Can the din
Whose thunders drown the wail of slavery's sin
O'erwhelm the voice, the penalty sublime,
That stamps oppression with the Eternal's curse,
And makes the tyrant hateful to the soul?
Foul is the very fact of servitude,
But the vile pleadings that defend it, worse:
Enough to reap the harvest with the shame,
Enough to bear the burthen and the blame;
But to hold up the fetters of the poor
And prostrate slave as trophies, and to claim
A gospel heritage, a Christian name,
O this is more than patience can endure!

* Or, if you please, *the Gospel and Conscience*; but the idea remains virtually the same; for conscience without liberty is dead; and if we claim liberty and use it bravely, it is only for the sake of conscience and by its means.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF WARRINGTON ACADEMY.*

BY HENRY A. BRIGHT, B.A.

THE summer of 1760 saw the beginning of a series of misunderstandings between Dr. Taylor and the Trustees, which were only terminated the following year by Dr. Taylor's death. Mr. John Taylor, of Norwich, in his "History of the Octagon Chapel," says of his grandfather, "His own failing health, anxiety for the health of his wife, and disappointments and annoyances connected with the Academy, conspired to render Dr. Taylor's brief residence at Warrington entirely unhappy." In the minutes of the Academy, the whole story appears at length. Dr. Taylor had been complaining of "the uneasiness he is under in his present situation," and the Trustees write and ask him to specify his complaints. And then follows a long string of complaints from the Doctor, with the comments of the Committee upon each of them. Dr. Taylor does not approve of the situation of the Academy, and some books which he asked for had not been purchased,—Mr. Seddon has invaded his province of Moral Philosophy by giving a course of lectures,—the Committee have no right to interfere in the internal arrangements of the Academy. The Committee reply strongly and firmly to all these charges, but make a concession about the three books, and, with a slight touch of sarcasm perhaps, they send him the following resolution:

"Agreed nem. con. This is the unanimous sense of this Committee. Agreed, that the following books be immediately sent for at the desire of Dr. Taylor, viz.: Edwards on Irresistibility of Divine Grace; Pilkington's Script. Criticisms; Grotius on the Truth of Religion."

We need not enter further into this unhappy quarrel. Traces of its ill effects appear in many of Mr. Seddon's letters, and it gave a blow to the Academy from which it never entirely recovered. The subscriptions from other places might be increased, but the Presbyterian body was no longer united. The friends of Dr. Taylor and many of his old congregation had lost confidence in the management of the Academy, and too often checked or thwarted the efforts of its supporters.†

In 1761, Dr. Aikin was promoted to the Theological Tutorship, which was now vacant by Dr. Taylor's death. Mr. (afterwards the celebrated Dr.) Priestley was chosen to succeed Dr. Aikin as Tutor of Languages and Polite Literature. Of Dr. Priestley, it must be unnecessary for me to speak. Eminent as a chemist, a philosopher, a politician and a theologian, he was one of the most remarkable men of his day. It is Coleridge who

* Continued from p. 689.

† "There had been an unhappy difference between Dr. Taylor and the Trustees, in consequence of which all his friends, who were numerous, were our enemies."—*Dr. Priestley's Life*, p. 55.

addresses him as "Patriot, and Saint, and Sage;" and whether we agree with or differ from his views on philosophy or theology, we can have but one opinion of the vastness of his learning and the purity of his life. He was the greatest of the many worthies of the Warrington Academy.

In the following year, 1762, Mr. Seddon visited London and other towns in order to beat up new subscribers, and in this he was partially successful. At any rate, it was now thought desirable to leave the old Academy and erect more suitable buildings in another part of the town. The Academy Place, as it is called, which opens out of the Butter-Market Street, is to this day a quiet and secluded court. In front stands the Academy, an old brick building, with stone copings, and a clock and bell turret in the centre. It cannot pretend to architectural beauty, but it is not unpleasing with its quaint old-world look, and was certainly a great improvement on the house by the "classic tide" of the Mersey. This second Academy building was also celebrated in verse by Mrs. Barbauld :

"Lo ! there the seat where science loved to dwell,
Where liberty her ardent spirit breathed."

The lower room of the building is now the printing-office of the "Warrington Guardian," and the upper room is appropriated as the "Warrington Church Institute." I wonder if the printers ever hear among the clang and clatter of their presses "the learned echoes talk;" or if the Warrington clergy, in their discussions, ever give a kindly thought or word to Aikin, Priestley, Enfield and the other true-hearted men who once tenanted those rooms !

From 1762 to 1780 was the golden age of the Academy; and of these years, the earlier ones to 1767 (when Dr. Priestley removed to Leeds) were the brightest and the happiest. The life of the Tutors was of course, in some degree, an anxious one, but there was much of pleasure in their hours of social enjoyment. "The Tutors in my time," says Dr. Priestley, "lived in the most perfect harmony. We drank tea together every Saturday, and our conversation was equally instructive and pleasing. I often thought it not a little extraordinary that four persons, who had no previous knowledge of each other, should have been brought to unite in conducting such a scheme as this, and be all zealous *necessarians* as we were. We were all likewise Arians; and the only subject of much consequence on which we differed respected the doctrine of Atonement, concerning which Dr. Aikin held some obscure notions. The only Socinian in the neighbourhood was Mr. Seddon, of Manchester, and we all wondered at him."

But there were other attractions in the Warrington circle besides the Tutors and their philosophy. "We have a knot of lasses just after your own heart," writes Mrs. Barbauld (then

Miss Aikin), in 1772, to her friend Miss Belsham,—“as merry, blithe and gay as you would wish them, and very smart and clever; two of them are the Miss Rigbys. We have a West-Indian family, too, that I think you would like,—a young couple who seem intended by nature for nothing but mirth, frolic and gaiety.” It was a sad day for Warrington when Miss Lizzy Rigby became Mrs. Bunny, and Miss Sally Rigby was wooed and wedded by Dr. Parry, of Bath; it was sadder still when Mr. Edwards, the lively West Indian, had to slip away from his creditors and leave Warrington for ever; saddest of all was it when “our poetess” herself, after winning the hearts of half the students, some one or two of whom for her sake lived (I am informed) “sighing and single”—when she, too, followed the Miss Rigbys’ unfortunate example, and was carried off to Palgrave by that queer little man whom henceforth she was to “honour and obey.” But these catastrophes were not yet. And then, besides the Rigbys, the Aikins, and, a little later on, the Enfields, were the Priestleys and the Seddons. Of Dr. Priestley’s wife, every one, and especially her husband (who ought to know), speaks most highly. Mrs. Seddon was a lady of fortune and position. She was a daughter to Mr. Hoskins, who had been equerry to Frederick, Prince of Wales. I have no doubt she was a very fine lady at Warrington. I know that she was an affectionate wife and spelt abominably. Among the Seddon papers* is a letter which her husband wrote to her during a short absence in 1766. On the back of his letter, Mrs. Seddon prepares a rough draft of an answer to her truant husband. The word which puzzles her most is “adieu,” and she has to spell it over three times before she can determine whether the “e” comes before the “i” or the “i” before the “e.” The knotty point is at last settled and the fair copy written out; and this, too, her careful husband put away and preserved among his papers. I cannot resist quoting the last paragraph of this most charming but laborious letter:

“Let me hear of you as often as you can, for it does me more good and has a much stronger affect upon my spirits than either eather or salvolatiley. Adieu, my dear; except the sincerest and best wishes for your health and happiness, of one whose greatest pleasure in this world is in subscribing herself your truly affectionate wife,

“J. SEDDON.

“P.S. I shall want cash before you return; what must I doe? Pray put me in a way how to replenish. Remember me properly to every body.”

* Let me here add a note about Mr. Seddon’s correspondents. Among them were Dr. Priestley (sixteen of whose letters I have discovered), Dr. Kippis, David Williams (who founded the Literary Fund), Dr. Percival, Thomas Bentley, of Liverpool (whom we know from Mr. Boardman’s “Bentleiana”), Rev. W. Turner, of Wakefield, and Dr. Aikin. The most amusing letters, however, are those of R. Griffiths, the bookseller, and publisher of the “Monthly Review,”—a man, the unfavourable side of whose character is freely, though not quite fairly perhaps, given to us in Mr. Forster’s Life of Goldsmith.

No wonder this excellent wife, who in 1770 became a widow, should have received in 1773 a letter from a certain Mr. Richard Meanley, which commences thus:

“ Madm.—There is a gentleman of my acquaintance, a widower, who has such a high opinion of the happiness of the married state, that he is desirous of entering into it again; if you have the same, and are disengaged, he proposes, by your permission, to pay you a visit.”

I can find no rough draft of Mrs. Seddon’s answer to this letter.

Of Mrs. Barbauld (though I have often quoted her), and of her brother, John Aikin, the scholarly physician, I have said nothing, nor was it needed. The memoir which his daughter wrote is the best monument of the one. The other is dear to the memory of every child who learns the “hymns in prose;” and but the other day Lord Brougham paid an eloquent tribute to her memory in the course of a debate in the House of Lords.

Here is a pleasant little sketch of Warrington society, from an unpublished letter of Miss Lucy Aikin’s:

“ Both ‘bouts rimés’ and ‘vers de société’ were in fashion with the set. Once it was their custom to slip anonymous pieces into Mrs. Priestley’s work-bag. One ‘copy of verses,’ a very eloquent one, puzzled all guessers a long time; at length it was traced to Dr. Priestley’s self.* Somebody was bold enough to talk of getting up private theatricals. This was a dreadful business! All the wise and grave, the whole Tutorhood, cried out, It must not be! The students, the Rigbys, and, I must add, my aunt, took the prohibition very sulkily; and my aunt’s Ode to Wisdom was the result.”

And then, besides the residents, there were distinguished strangers who came to Warrington to consult the Tutors or to visit the students. Howard, the philanthropist, came, in order that the younger Aikin might revise his MSS. and correct his proofs. Roscoe, of Liverpool, came, and first learned to care for botany from his visits to the Warrington Botanical Gardens. Pennant, the naturalist, Currie, the biographer of Burns, and many a Presbyterian minister, eminent then, though now forgotten, were also among the visitors to that Athens of our county.

Warrington was then an enviable place, and I, for one, agree with Miss Lucy Aikin, when she says in a letter now before me,

“ I have often thought with envy of that society. Neither Oxford nor Cambridge could boast of brighter names in literature or science than several of those Dissenting Tutors,—humbly content, in an obscure town and on a scanty pittance, to cultivate in themselves and communicate to a rising generation those mental acquirements and moral habits which are their own exceeding great reward. They and theirs lived together like one large family, and in the facility of their intercourse

* Dr. Priestley says in his Memoirs, “Mrs. Barbauld has told me that it was the perusal of some verses of mine that first induced her to write anything in verse; so that this country is in some measure indebted to me for one of the best poets it can boast of.”—P. 49.

they found large compensation for its deficiency in luxury and splendour."

In 1767, the Academy lost the services of Dr. Priestley, and, in 1770, the no less valuable services of Mr. Seddon. Dr. Priestley resigned, he tells us, partly on account of his wife, and partly because the salary of £100 per annum, with a house, and £15 a-year for boarders, was insufficient for the maintenance of his family.

The death of Mr. Seddon, who was seized with apoplexy when on horseback, was a sudden and a fearful blow. To him was owing the very existence of the Academy; as Secretary, he had been from the beginning its most energetic supporter; as "Rector Academiæ," he had been for the last few years the adviser of the Tutors and the guide and instructor of the students. His lectures on Oratory and Grammar were prepared with care, and were considered powerful and effective. Several of his MSS. are still in the library of Manchester New College, and one small MS. volume of lectures is preserved in the library of Renshaw-Street chapel, Liverpool. Dr. Priestley was succeeded by Mr. John Reinhold Forster, a German scholar and naturalist. This eminent man, who afterwards accompanied Captain Cook in his second voyage round the world, and who was one of the best of living botanists, undertook to fill the chairs of Natural History and Modern Languages, in addition to which he took the junior classes in Latin and in Greek. Mr. Forster, however, remained at Warrington but a short time; his irritable temper, and the entire want of economy which he displayed in all his arrangements, made him out of place in a situation where mutual forbearance and courtesy were so much required, and where, among the Tutors at least, extravagance was unknown.

Mr. Enfield was chosen to fill the place of Mr. Seddon, and to him, who remained a Tutor in the Academy to the last, was entrusted the double charge of the Tutorship of the Belles Lettres and the office of Rector Academiæ,* which last post is about equivalent to a Deanship in the colleges of the older universities. Dr. Enfield was a good and accomplished man, and his compilation called "The Speaker" is still an authority in its humble way.

Before me lies a little quarto pamphlet of seven pages, entitled, "Report of the State of the Warrington Academy, by the Trustees, at their Annual Meeting, June 28th, 1770." The Trustees inform the public that the design of the Academy is the "liberal education of youth in general." They prepare students for commerce or the law, for physic or the ministry; they are

* Perhaps I should have stated that the origin of this office was the necessity of having some responsible person to superintend the morals of the students, who in 1767 were collected together in a range of new apartments built on the collegiate principle; formerly they had been boarded in separate private houses.

anxious about discipline and good order, industry and virtuous behaviour, and they wish the terms of the education to be as "easy" as the nature of the design and circumstances will permit. They say that Dr. Aikin undertakes the Latin and Greek classes; Mr. Holt, the Mathematical department; Mr. Enfield, the lectures on Language, on Commerce and on History. There are also Tutors for Modern Languages (a Mr. La Tour was Mr. Forster's successor in this department), and a teacher of Drawing and Book-keeping. "To prepare students for the ministry, a course of studies which employs five years is appointed." For these students, there were courses on Logic, Ontology, Pneumatology, Ethics, Jurisprudence, the Evidences of Revelation and its peculiar Doctrines, Jewish Antiquities, Church History and the Pastoral Office. The annual fees to each Tutor are £3. 3s., and £1. 1s. must be paid for the use of the library. There follows an admission that the students have given ground of complaint as to the "exactness of the discipline," and a promise that for the future new regulations shall be put in force. Several of these regulations are referred to, an appeal for support is made, and the Report winds up with a list of the committee and officials.

This Report was needed, for the Academy was not gaining in the confidence of the public, and £1700 (for which the Trustees held themselves responsible on a mortgage of the premises) had just been spent in the erection of the new range of students' lodgings-rooms.

In 1772, the death of Mr. Holt, who had been Mathematical Tutor from the very beginning, caused another vacancy. He was succeeded by the Rev. George Walker. Mr. Walker was a learned and a most excellent man, and Gilbert Wakefield and Miss Lucy Aikin both bear witness to the affection and regard which he inspired in all who knew him. His residence in Warrington, however, was of barely two years' duration; the salary which could be afforded to him was too small for his necessities, and he was compelled to resign his post. "In fact," as Miss Aikin says, "the *alma mater* of Warrington was ever a niggardly recompence of the distinguished abilities and virtues which were enlisted in her service."

After Mr. Walker's departure, Dr. Enfield undertook the Mathematical department in addition to his own laborious courses; and in consequence of Mr. Rigby (father, I suppose, of the two beauties) resigning his situation as "provider of the commons," Dr. Enfield good-naturedly also added the commissariat to his other duties. Dr. Aikin in his turn relieved his colleague from the Logic; and Mr. Aikin, afterwards the eminent surgeon, who had now settled in Warrington, lectured on Chemistry and Anatomy to those who chose to attend him.

The business of the Academy went on, from 1774 to 1778, under the sole management of the two Tutors, Aikin and Enfield,

who were really performing the same work which had hitherto been divided among three.

In 1778, however, Dr. Aikin began to fail, and he was obliged to obtain the assistance of a former pupil, Mr. Houghton. The following year, Mr. Gilbert Wakefield was chosen a regular third Tutor, and a few months after Dr. Aikin died. For twenty years had he been Tutor at the Academy, and his death was to it an irreparable loss. A noble man! nor undeserving of the words which Gilbert Wakefield inscribed upon his tomb:

Comis, Benevolus, Pius,
Et Hominis et Christiani munera
Cumulatissime explevit.

Dr. Nicholas Clayton, of Liverpool, was now (1781) appointed Tutor in Theology, and he, Dr. Enfield and Mr. Wakefield, remained Tutors till the Academy's dissolution in 1786.

I must now say some few words respecting the two new Tutors, who were henceforth Dr. Enfield's colleagues.

Dr. Clayton had been minister to the Octagon chapel in Liverpool, where an attempt had been made for the first time to introduce a Liturgy among Protestant Dissenters. The attempt failed, and Dr. Clayton, after ministering for a few years to the Benn's-Garden congregation, received the invitation to Warrington. His sermons were noticeable for the beauty of their style and the originality of their thought. He was so modest, however, that his friends could never persuade him to publish; and, dearly loved as he was, his name will soon be forgotten, except as the last Tutor of the Academy. He died in Liverpool, in the year 1797.

It is a remarkable proof of the liberality of opinion which was so marked a characteristic of the Academy, that Gilbert Wakefield should have feared that his secession from the Church of England would be an impediment to his appointment as Tutor. Certain it is that, when he applied for the post, the Trustees (every one of whom was a Presbyterian) were anxiously looking for some clergyman of the Church to whom they might entrust it. Whether they trusted to conciliate further support by this mode,—whether they thought that a University man might help in maintaining the relaxed discipline,—whether they believed some fresh system of study would probably be introduced,—or whether they were actuated by a hope that theological differences would thus be broken down,—I cannot tell. By Mr. Wakefield's appointment, two at least of these objects would be secured; and the strong testimonials of Dr. Jebb and others gained him the Tutorship.

Mr. Wakefield will hereafter be remembered as the editor of *Lucretius*. A learned and ingenious, though a somewhat careless, scholar, he claims his rank among the foremost of Cambridge men who have thrown light on the pages of the ancient classics.

His conscientious integrity was shewn by his resignation of his position in the Church of England. His zealous ardour was evinced in later years by a political pamphlet, which cost him a two years' imprisonment. His controversial writings may well be allowed to die; but his *Lucretius* will probably be remembered so long as in England *Lucretius* itself is studied.

There is one question more in connection with the Tutors of the Academy which is too curious to overlook, though I am not enabled to throw much fresh light upon it. The Rev. W. Turner says, in one of his papers in the Monthly Repository, that among the foreigners who from time to time were engaged to fill Mr. Reinhold Forster's place, as teachers of Modern Languages, was a M. le Maitre, alias Mara, and this he believes was probably the infamous Marat of the French Revolution. He links together the following chain of evidence on the point:

"Mara, as his name is spelt in the minutes of the Academy, very soon left Warrington, whence he went to Oxford, robbed the Ashmolean Museum, escaped to Ireland, was apprehended in Dublin, tried and convicted in Oxford under the name of Le Maitre, and sentenced to the hulks at Woolwich. Here one of his old pupils at Warrington, a native of Bristol, saw him. He was afterwards a bookseller in Bristol, and failed, was confined in the gaol of that city, but released by the society there for the relief of prisoners confined for small sums. One of that society, who had personally relieved him in Bristol gaol, afterwards saw him in the National Assembly in Paris in 1792."

Add to this, that Marat was certainly in England at or about this time, and had just published a philosophical essay on the connection between the body and soul of man. There is also the fact that a certain walk in Warrington still goes, so I am informed, by the name of "Marat's Walk."

Still I fear the testimony on the negative side is stronger. In the first place, Mr. Turner is, I believe, in error about the name of Mara appearing on the minutes of the Academy. I have searched them through, and employed the assistance of another for the same purpose, and the name of neither Mara nor Le Maitre could be found by us. In the eight or ten Academy reports before me, I find a M. Fantin la Tour; but here, too, the name of Mara or La Maitre is absent. Lastly, Miss Aikin, to whom I applied, informs me, "There was an *alarm* about Marat, but investigation set the matter at rest; they were certainly different men."

Even were not some account of the students and student life in itself an important page in the history of the Academy, it would still be necessary to refer to it, as the conduct of the students was one of the chief causes which led to the Academy's dissolution.

A complete list of the students may be found in the Monthly Repository of 1814, and I have another list in manuscript, drawn

up by Serjeant Heywood, but not including the last three years. There are some slight discrepancies as regards dates and Christian names, but the lists are substantially the same, and either of them is sufficiently correct. During the whole time of the Academy's existence (that is, from 1757 to 1786), there were 393 students, and the average number of entries was therefore about fourteen each year. This average remains steady throughout, and indeed, during the last years, there is rather an increase than a falling off. The first student who entered the Academy was one of the most distinguished in after life. The name of Dr. Percival, the physician and moralist, still claims its place among the worthies, not of Warrington alone, but of the whole of Lancashire. The vast majority of the students became either Unitarian ministers or wealthy merchants, or were afterwards lost sight of altogether: here and there, however, we may find some name which is or ought to be familiar to us, and you will allow me to draw them out from these long catalogues of the forgotten. Of Dr. Aikin, the physician, I have already spoken; he entered the Academy in the second year of its establishment. Dr. Rigby, of Norwich, also a physician,—Dr. Estlin, of Bristol, a well-known scholar and divine,—Serjeant Heywood, author of the “Vindication of Mr. Fox's History,” and a Welsh judge,—Archibald Hamilton Rowan, the Irish rebel,—and Malthus, the political economist,—such is a short and somewhat incongruous list of the best known among the students. But there were many others who were noted in their day, and who achieved success and fortune in their several callings, conspicuous among whom I find Lord Ennismore, Sir James Carnegie, of Southesk, Mr. Henry Beaufoy, Rev. Pendlebury Houghton and Dr. Crompton.

In looking over the students' names, I cannot but notice how many of their descendants are still the staunch supporters of the liberal Dissent which was the distinguishing characteristic of the Academy. Some families, like the Willoughbys of Parham, whose last Lord was educated at Warrington, have now died out; others, like the Aldersons, of Norwich, of which family the late Judge was a member, have seceded to the Church of England. But we still find united the lineal and the theological successors of the Academy's students, in the Rigbys, the Martineaus and the Taylors, of Norwich; the Heywoods and the Yateses, of Liverpool; the Potters, of Manchester; the Gaskells, of Wakefield; the Brights, of Bristol; the Shores, of Sheffield; the Hibberts, of Hyde; and the Wedgewoods, of Etruria.

But among the students were many who could not but cause great anxiety to those who had charge of the Academy; and, most trying of all, there seem to have been some hot-blooded young Irishmen, and some still more hot-blooded young West Indians, sons of planters in Jamaica, St. Kitts and Antigua. Indeed, the Tutors seem to have admitted any one who chose to

apply for admission; and Archibald Hamilton Rowan, in his Memoirs, only alludes to the Academy as being the place "where I spent a year of my rustication" from Cambridge.

Certainly the Rev. William Turner (himself a student at the Academy) gives a terrible picture of the insults to which that kindly and gentle Dr. Enfield was exposed, as Rector Academiæ, "by the dissipated and inflamed West Indian, whose pastime it had been from his youth to sport with human sufferings; by the profligate outcast of our great public schools, who had learned all the evil without any of the good of those establishments, and was sent hither as a *dernier ressort*; and by the pampered pet of large fortune, who, from the treatment he had seen given, and been allowed himself to give, to his private Tutor at home, had learned to consider every Tutor as a sort of upper servant." And unfortunately there was no sufficient discipline to restrain the evil or punish the offenders. Expulsion was the worst penalty that could be inflicted; and expulsion was a penalty for which the offender would not care, and for which the Academy itself might suffer. Plan after plan was tried, and plan after plan failed. Did the students lodge, as at first, in the Tutors' houses, —they fell in love with the young ladies, and studied anything rather than the divinity, and belles lettres, and logic, and rhetoric, which were the supposed attractions of the place. Did they live all together, as afterwards they did live, in a range of college rooms, —they got into debt, they played mad pranks in the town, and cost Mr. Seddon and then Dr. Enfield, their Rectors, many a long hour of anxiety and wretchedness. When I speak, as I soon must do, of the discussions respecting the dissolution of the Academy, I shall have to speak more at large of Dr. Enfield's feelings on this subject.

Let me now gather, as best I can, some stray illustrations of the wild life of the wilder of the Academy students. Of the quiet and respectable set, who afterwards reflected credit on their "alma mater," I can discover very little. I suppose there is nothing much to discover, however. They attended the Tutors' lectures, and took walks into the country with young Dr. Aikin, and listened to sermons in Cairo-Street chapel, and otherwise prepared themselves for a calm future of happy usefulness.

Meanwhile, the West Indians were bewailing their native islands, and shocking the Tutors by declaring that the earliest request of a planter's child was always for a "young nigger to kick." And then there was the love-making in the Tutors' houses. The beautiful Miss Rigbys made wild work with the students' hearts; and the Trustees had to insist that they must be removed from the house if any students stayed there. And so for a time they were; but Mrs. Rigby's health fortunately broke down, and the young ladies were brought back again. Rousseau's "Héloïse," too, had much to answer for; and at its appearance (so Miss

Aikin tells me), “everybody instantly fell in love with everybody;” and then it was that Mr. Barbauld won his bride.

Then the politics of the students were no less inconvenient than their flirtations. Strong Whigs, and something more, as the Tutors themselves were, they were alarmed and terrified at the anti-English zeal which, during the American War, was displayed by several of the students. One of them, who boarded at Dr. Enfield’s, insisted on his right to illuminate *his own* windows for an American victory; but this the Doctor declined to allow, as it committed himself, the master of the house.

Many are the stories told of the practical jokes which these wicked students played.

One morning, the landlords of the different inns in Warrington might have been seen with bewildered looks gazing up to the sign-boards which swung above their hospitable doors. Well might they be bewildered! In a single night the “Red Lion” had become the “Roebuck,” the “Nag’s Head” was the “Golden Horse Shoe,” the “Royal Oak” had changed places with the “Griffin,” and the “George and the Dragon” appeared now as the “Eagle and Child.” Another story is told of a most respectable lady who was coming from a ball. Her carriage stops the way—she is stepping towards it. But—what and how is this? The footmen are devils’ imps, with torches in their hands; the coachman grins down with a demon’s face from the box; and from the carriage comes forth to escort the lady home a terrible figure, but one easy to be recognized, with horns and tail and cloven feet. One student procured a black ox-skin, and haunted Bank Street night after night, till houses were deserted and Bank Street was half ruined. Another student put on a bear’s skin, and frightened an old nut-woman, who believed it was the devil.

Perhaps the wicked Miss Rigbys were the inspirers of these wicked pranks. Certainly they knew how to play them. On one occasion they had asked some of the students to supper. Hams and trifles and potted beef and other luxuries were placed before them, and the students were asked to help the ladies. But the hams were made of wood, and the trifles were plates of soap-suds, and the potted beef was potted sawdust, and the other luxuries were equally tempting and equally tantalizing.

There are other traditions of this kind still current in Warrington; but it would be unnecessary to quote more in order to shew how relaxed was the discipline and how wild the students. Among the Seddon papers, however, there are letters relating to two of Mr. Seddon’s pupils, which throw light on the way in which the Rector Academiæ dealt with particular cases, and which are not uninteresting in other respects.

In the August of 1768, Mr. Seddon received a letter from Mr. Samuel Vaughan, of Bristol, complaining bitterly of the disappointment he has felt as regards the Academy, and the

“ too great latitude allowed the students.” He thus expostulates :

“ My son Ben’s expenses during ten months’ absence amount to £112, and Billy’s to £59. 12s.; this (should nearly suffice for the University, and) of its self would to many be a sufficient objection; but, in my opinion, the consequence of the expence is abundantly more pernicious, as it naturally leads to levity, a love of pleasure, dissipation, and affectation of smartness; diverts the attention, and prevents the necessary application to serious thought and study. When I sent my sons so great a distance, it was with a view to preserve them from the reigning contagion of a dissipated age, to imbibe good morals, acquire knowledge, and to obtain a manly and solid way of thinking and acting; but they are returned with high ideas of modern refinements, of dress and external accomplishments, which if ever necessary, yet resumed by them much too soon. As one instance—they think it a sight to appear without having their hair frizzened, and this must be done by a dresser, even upon the Sabbath. No person can more wish for and encourage an open and liberal way of thinking and acting than myself, yet do I think that day should be kept with ancient solemnity; for, to say the least, the reverse gives offence to many serious good people, and exhibits an ill example at a time when religion is at so low an ebb as to stand in need of every tie and prop (whether real or imaginary) for its support; therefore any relaxation or innovation under sanction of such a seminary as yours, may have the most pernicious tendency; for when restraints even in unessential things are removed, they are frequently a clue or gradation to the fashionable levity of the age and irreligion.”

But the same post brought Mr. Seddon a second letter. The accused, Ben Vaughan (who afterwards became a useful member of society, and a member of Parliament also), wrote to Mr. Seddon, expressing his contrition for the past, and promising penitence in the future. He is afraid his conduct may have acted injuriously on the Academy,—he has encroached on Mr. Seddon’s goodness and forbearance,—ill-natured people will say ill-natured things.

“ They say we are gay and idle, business gives way to pleasure, and, instead of receiving improvement, we are taught how to live idly. This has been said in my hearing. But tho’ I am certain that none of us have been vicious, but only gay, this has been laid to our charge. Our recreations have been innocent, tho’ expensive; but they imagine that they cannot be expensive without being criminal. I believe that none of us have received any injury from the liberty allowed us, but others may make a bad use of it.”

And then, having finished his confession, Mr. Benjamin Vaughan confides to Mr. Seddon that Mr. Wilkes will probably get a pardon from the Crown, and that he (Mr. Vaughan) does not believe that Mr. Wilkes ever wrote the “ North Briton, No. 45.”

But Benjamin Vaughan’s contrition was not very fruitful. Next year he has again to write to Mr. Seddon, to confess that

he cannot shew his accounts to his father, and to sign himself, “Your affectionate but distressed pupil.” He compares, too, so badly with his brother, who has only spent £60; but here is an extract from his letter:

“My father, last year, was extremely angry at an acct. I gave him of £112, spent at Warrington; the present sum is £179. Bill disclaims all share in the expenses above £60. *I*, then, have £119 to answer for; *I*, who promised such strict amendment, and who had as many excuses last year as at present. I had more journies, more music; and yet, according to his knowledge, have spent £7 more in my present year of penance, repentance, &c.”

Another series of letters refers to the notorious Archibald Hamilton Rowan. He will be remembered by every student of Irish history as the friend of Napper Tandy, and as having been tried for sedition in 1792. But he will be remembered by many more as the prisoner in whose defence Curran uttered his noble and famous eulogium on British law,—that law “which proclaims even to the stranger and the sojourner, the moment he sets his foot on British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy and consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation.”

In 1769, this Hamilton Rowan (whom, by the way,* Mrs. Schimmelpenninck, in her late Memoirs, appears to confound with “Fighting Fitzgerald,” who never was at Warrington), this future rebel, having been rusticated from Cambridge, came to pass his year of banishment under the care of Mr. Seddon. The experiment was not a hopeful one; it proved signally unsuccessful.

In the Biography of Hamilton Rowan, which was afterwards written, his residence at Warrington was scarcely alluded to; and except a casual allusion to his early admiration for Mrs. Barbauld as a girl, nothing had been recorded of this period of his life. The letters of Mr. Seddon help to fill up the gap.

Mr. Hamilton, the father, writes on the 1st of June to announce the coming of his son, who is “to have any sum not exceeding one hundred pounds a-year.” Two months only pass, and Mr. Seddon has to send the following letter to Archibald Hamilton Rowan, Esq., at the Swan with Two Necks, Lad Lane, London:

“Hereford, August 2nd, 1769.

“Sir,—From the clandestine manner in which you left Warrington and withdrew yourself from our protection, I did not expect to hear from you any more, though, when I consider the indecent and shameful manner in which you behaved at Liverpool, I do not wonder at it. Be assured, Sir, that such conduct will not be permitted at Warrington, and I hope you will not return there any more. You were told very plainly and freely on what terms your continuance there depended; you promised to comply with them; but you have acted contrary to them

* Indeed, almost every statement made by Mrs. Schimmelpenninck respecting the Academy is incorrect.

in every instance: there is no dependence to be had on your resolutions and promises; and therefore I beg to repeat to you, what has several times been said to you, that you had better retire from the Academy at Warrington, and not expose your self to the disgrace of being dismissed in another manner. I do not think my self at liberty to send you a dft. on Messrs. Allen's and Marlar; they are proper judges of what is proper and necessary, and to them I refer you. I have written to them this post, and I beg you will wait on them immediately on the receipt of this, and follow the advice they give you.

“I was very much disposed to be your friend, and to have led you into such a plan of study and course of behaviour as would have been useful to you; but this is a pleasure you have absolutely refused to, Sir, your most humble servant,

“J. SEDDON.”

And then follows a letter from Mr. Hamilton Rowan respecting his debts:

“Nook, Sat. Eve., 1769.

“Sir,—I have, according to your desire, recollect as much as I was able the manner in which the £40 was expended; the receipts, which I send you, I think amount to £16. 17s. 6d., which, together with 2 guineas which I reckon for washing, mending, &c., 5 guineas which I borrowed from you, and the trifle due to the Academy, bring the amount to £27. 5s. 6d. £6 or £7 to Mr. Jones, and £4. 4s. for one month's lodging here, I paid out of £15. 5s. reckoned from Mr. Jones. Mr. Wainwright's bill remains unpaid, which I think is the only bill, except Jones his, I owe in Warrington. 5 guineas will be sufficient for the journey; but I shall have one month's lodging to pay here before I go; if I can sell my horse, I shall not want so much money; I expect to sell her for 11 guineas, and unless I can gett that sum for her, I shall not part with her. From this, Sir, you may judge of the situation of your obliged, humble servant,

“ARCH. HAMILTON ROWAN.”

Lastly, we have five agonizing letters from Mr. Rowan's London agents, Messrs. Allen, Marlar and Co. They sympathize with Mr. Seddon in his troubles; they “make no doubt of his good disposition towards this young gentleman,” in whose “capacity, politeness and goodness of heart,” they have still great hopes; they condemn Mr. Rowan's “imprudence,” but think his desire to pay his debts at Warrington “redounds to his reputation;” and then, reminding Mr. Seddon that his refractory pupil is heir to a good fortune, they express their anxiety to arrange matters so that all may still be right.

But Mr. Hamilton Rowan had nevertheless to leave Warrington. His next appearance in public brought him into other companionship than quiet Mr. Seddon or apologetic Messrs. Allen and Marlar.

It is but right, however, to add, that there are among this Seddon correspondence letters of quite another tone. I find one letter from young George Willoughby, afterwards seventeenth

and last Lord Willoughby of Parham,* and last of the old Presbyterian nobility of England. He, being away for the vacation, writes to Mr. Seddon, "I am at a loss for words to express myself in that affectionate manner that you do to me, but you know I mean it." And he goes on to assure him that it is "with a great deal of pleasure" that he will once more return to Warrington.

One more letter I cannot but refer to, as shewing a curious tinge of intolerance in even the Warrington Academy and its supporters. A worthy correspondent of Mr. Seddon is astonished to hear that a student in whom he took interest had a "Methodist" turn, and the correspondent is quite surprised and very much scandalized. He had no idea of such a thing. Had he had such an idea, he would never have taken any trouble or care about the young man. So even the Warrington Academy and its supporters, all liberal and all tolerant, had their little prejudices, their favourite aversions.

But the history of the Academy is now coming to an end. In 1782, the difficulties arising from the insubordination of the students on the one hand, and a pressure of debt for building expenses on the other, were becoming formidable. To meet the latter evil, a subscription was entered upon, headed by Sir Henry Hoghton; Mr. Tayleur, of Shrewsbury; Mr. Hardman, of Alleserton; Mr. Bright, of Bristol; and Mr. Newton, of Norton, who each contributed £100, and a total amount of about £2500 is raised.

But the difficulties are still great, and the Academy is still declining. Dr. Enfield seems to have felt that the house was falling, and was the first to raise the alarm. In December, 1782, he writes to Mr. (afterwards Serjeant) Heywood, and says that he sees "much reason for despondency. Our number of students is only seventeen; of these, only eight are expected to return next session. After the experience of many years, I find myself confirmed in the opinion that it is impracticable in such a place as ours, where youths from fourteen to eighteen years of age are placed in college apartments, without any superior resident amongst them, and free from all domestic restraints. Irregularities have from time to time unavoidably arisen, which have at last, I am afraid, led the public to form a decided judgment against the Academy." He goes on to state that students have lately been coming from those places only where the Academy is little known. Liverpool and Manchester supply very few, and one only of the Trustees would send a son of his to the Academy. Dr. Enfield concludes by a suggestion that a "domestic

* It is of these Willoughbys of Parham that that beautiful "Lady Willoughby's Diary" tells us. It is a strange mistake, however, in the accomplished authoress, to represent the Willoughbys as an Episcopalian family, especially since her own sympathies lie in the Presbyterian direction.

plan of education" might be substituted, and implies that he would willingly undertake it. In January, 1783, Dr. Enfield repeated his distrust and his discomfort in a memorial addressed to the Trustees. He speaks of the hopes they had entertained, and of the disappointment which had resulted. The Tutors, he says, had done everything that could be done; but "an idle waste of time, a coarse and vulgar familiarity, a disposition towards riot and mischief, intemperance, and, in some instances, gaming, profaneness and licentious manners, have found their way into a seminary intended to train up youth in habits of sobriety and virtue." And then he repeats "his plan of a domestic education."

I find another memorial from Mr. Wakefield, which bears out in a great measure Dr. Enfield's complaints. The students are too young and too ill-educated when they come; they are thrown together in a large sequestered house; there is no sufficient power of enforcing discipline; the Academy is neither school nor college; it is without the supervision exercised in the one, and it wants the influence and authority of the other; the students are treated as men, while they are but a set of wild and reckless boys.

In these statements there may have been some little exaggeration; but the evils were certainly great, and the applications from students very few. It is decided at a meeting of the Trustees that the Academy should be closed. For some months there seems to have been much discussion, and some warm discussion, with regard to the Academy. Some of the subscribers wish an amalgamation with Daventry. Others do not wish it closed at all, and, in the September of 1785, they manage to carry resolutions that "the Academy shall not be dissolved," but that henceforth "the students be required to lodge in the houses of the Tutors." But no resolution could revive the Academy. The students still dropped off, and the Tutors had no heart left.

On 29th of June, 1786, there was another full meeting of Trustees, Thos. B. Bayley, Esq., in the chair, and a resolution, passed by a majority of 54 votes, for the last time decided the fate of the Warrington Academy.

It would now be of little interest to any one were I to unravel the tangle of conflicting interests and contradictory schemes which for nearly a year confused and divided the supporters of the Academy. A College at Manchester was at last established, and to this the Warrington Trustees resolved to transfer their library and half the clear produce of the sale of the Academy buildings. The latter part of the gift was of no great value. The books still remain, and are still perhaps the finest part of the noble theological library of the Manchester College. Of that College itself—differ from its principles as and how we like—I need only say, that for seventy years it has continued, with varying success,

to train up pious and enlightened ministers for that body of Christians who founded the Warrington Academy. Established at Manchester, it then removed to York; it returned again to Manchester, and has now removed to London. Whatever may be its failings, it still retains the old Warrington characteristics of a freedom quite unshackled, a fearless daring in the search of truth, and a clear and penetrating glance into the deepest problems of theology.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. NOAH JONES, OF GATEACRE.

WHEN the announcement was made, three months ago, of the sudden and unlooked-for death of the Rev. NOAH JONES, many were the mourners who felt that they had lost a dear friend and a beloved pastor. A life which had been devoted, from a very early age, to the high and worthy aims of the Christian ministry,—and forty-two years of which had been spent in the faithful employment of more than ordinary powers in the service of Truth and Right,—could not but have created a strong and lasting impression on many minds, and have called forth a warm interest, which would fain see some written record of the life that had been closed on earth. For the sake of many who, as they read these pages, will fill up the imperfect outline from the resources of their own knowledge and affectionate regard, this brief memoir is written. There are few striking incidents to record, and the best part of his character was shewn in much that cannot be written down without making public things with which a stranger may not intermeddle. But the sketch may serve to recall to those who knew him, both the work he did accomplish, and the bright hopes and aims which were destined to be only partially fulfilled in this world; while a stranger may recognize and admire a worthy instance of those good lives that bless the world, spreading around the best influences of the religion that sanctifies men's daily lot, and is at the root of all domestic and social happiness and well-being.

George and Sarah Jones, of Etruria, in the district of the Staffordshire Potteries, named their eldest son Noah, after his uncle, the Rev. Noah Hill. He was born on Jan. 13, 1801, and, under the care and advice of his uncle, was designed for the ministry, from an early age; and as the character and tendencies of the boy's mind began to be discerned, the choice of his calling seemed fully justified. His parents were connected with the Independent body. They were bound to no narrow and exclusive views, but were anxious to teach their children the best lessons of practical religion and a sincere personal belief. His

mother's memory, especially, he always held very dear, and would say how much he owed to her strong yet gentle influence over him in the days of his boyhood.

After gaining a good name at school, and adopting, as his own earnest wish, the desire of his friends that he should enter the ministry, he began his special training for it at the institution known then as Coward's College, at Wymondley, and now incorporated with New College, St. John's Wood. He had not been long engaged in his theological studies, before he began to question some of the doctrines of the orthodox creed, in the profession of which he had been brought up. His mind could not be satisfied with the views which were expounded by the Tutors, and which the students were expected to adopt and to preach. It was not in his nature to conceal the change that was coming over his mind, and, exercising the right he claimed of free thought and free speech, he soon brought upon himself the suspicion of heresy. This suspicion presently assumed the form of a more definite charge of preaching "Socinianism" in his sermons, and unsettling the minds of the other students. It appears that there was at this time a party amongst the students holding strictly "orthodox" opinions, who were willing to act with the Tutors in preventing the growth of "dangerous opinions" in the institution, and in giving it a decidedly sectarian character, which had certainly not been intended by its original constitution, according to which, the young men who were to be educated for the ministry were held to no doctrinal confession.

It was reported that a representation was to be made to the Tutors, in order to prevent the suspected students from preaching; and Mr. Jones, knowing that he was especially aimed at, resolved to anticipate the motion by requesting that he might not be sent any more to officiate at the places where the students were accustomed to preach. In a conference with the Tutors, he modestly, but firmly, defended his position. He was unwilling to preach if his services were complained of; but he maintained his right to examine for himself the grounds of his faith, and declared that he could only hold such a form of religion as approved itself to his own reason and conscience. The Tutors expressed their aversion to Unitarianism,—were deeply concerned at finding their young friends imbibing such dangerous sentiments,—and felt that something must be done to stop the progress of heresy. Other interviews were held, at which Mr. Jones was required to make a statement of his religious views. But, while acknowledging that he did not come up to the doctrinal standard which they deemed essential, he would not admit their right to demand of him any confession of faith. He referred to his sermons and conversation as giving sufficient indications of the nature of his views,—shewed that the constitution of the College had always been liberal, and that a diversity of opinions

had been allowed. The Tutors declared their determination not to countenance any such dangerous errors as those which had been referred to, leading as they did to certain destruction. They intimated that he was dishonest, or ashamed of his opinions, or that fear or pride kept him silent. He replied that he was conscious of no such unworthy motives; but he simply denied their authority to require of him a statement of his creed. He had been guided by a sincere desire to learn the truth as it is in Jesus, and to act according to the dictates of a clear conscience; but he could acknowledge no human authority in matters of religion.

It was not only Mr. Jones's own change of views that was deplored and condemned, but also his influence on the minds of the other students, many of whom sympathized with him in the general tone of his views; and he appears to have been at this time a leading spirit among a band of young men who were becoming imbued with the principles of a liberal faith. By his clear, logical reasoning, his thoughtful inquiry into the great questions of religion, his careful study of the Scriptures in the light of reason and conscience, he acquired a great influence over the minds of those who were at all disposed to question the doctrines of orthodoxy. His frank and genial spirit, his bright and sunny disposition, made him a favourite companion of those who were much his seniors; and the endeavour was vain to exact from those who were known or suspected to be inclined to adopt his views, a pledge that they would not converse on controverted subjects with one who "had brought erroneous sentiments into the house, and had been the means of spreading them amongst the students." The end of the matter was, that Mr. Jones's refusal to make a formal statement of his religious opinions, was construed as an act of personal disrespect and insult towards the Tutors. On their representation, the Trustees required him to make an apology, which was of course refused; on which they recommended him, as he would not acknowledge "the very unbecoming temper and spirit he had shewn," by all means to withdraw himself from the institution. In reply, he protested against being thus judged, without having been allowed to make his own statement. He expressed in manly and dignified terms his conscious innocence of having done anything deserving of rebuke; and, accepting their invitation to withdraw, he declared his desire to repay the Trustees for his obligations to them, by proving to them and to the world that he was not utterly unworthy of their kindness, and that he never was that "evil, mischievous and destroying spirit" which he had been represented to be.

He left at once, to the great regret of many of his fellow-students, whose respect and love he had won; and at parting they presented him with an address, bearing testimony to the excellent

spirit he had uniformly displayed in the common hall, to the amiableness of his temper and the rectitude of his principles. To this address were appended the names of ten students, viz., Thomas Binney, W. S. Brown, Samuel Allard, J. Mitchelson, E. R. Dimock, E. Jay, G. Robson, T. Middleton, J. Pearce, S. A. Davies.

The following day he arrived in London and waited upon two of the Trustees, when he found, to his utter surprise, that a letter had been despatched to Wymondley to stop his leaving, in consequence of the explanations contained in his last reply. His determination had, however, been taken, and he had said a final farewell to Wymondley.

He was now nineteen, and, leaving college before his course had been completed, it was his desire to have continued his studies for a while at Glasgow. But this intention was abandoned, in consequence of his receiving an invitation to preach as a candidate at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, the pulpit of which was vacant by the resignation of the Rev. John Holland. As the congregation delayed in coming to a decision, he accepted in the mean time an invitation to Walmsley, in the neighbourhood of Bolton, where he continued to preach for some months, while he had the opportunity of strengthening his connection with many friends and admirers at Bolton. In May, 1821, he was invited by the majority of the Bank-Street congregation to become their minister, and, in September of the same year, entered upon his duties there. He soon proved both his zeal and his power in setting forth the truths which he held so dear. Those who attended on his ministry then, speak of the attractive force of the young preacher's earnest and affectionate manner, the devoutness of his spirit and the eloquence of his words. "Well do I remember," says one of his early friends and brother ministers, "when I first heard him, thinking that the spirit of Doddridge was again upon the earth."

But the work which he had begun with so much zeal and hope was to be soon interrupted. Scarcely had a year passed before symptoms of what was believed to be consumption began to shew themselves, and he was warned to seek a warmer climate and to cease from preaching. On arriving at Liverpool, however, whence he was to have sailed in a few days for Madeira, a different verdict was pronounced on his case. He stayed in Liverpool for some time; and after the interval of comparative rest and quiet, spent amongst friends, who remained, through life, dear to him as his own brothers and sisters, he was able to return to his duties at Bolton. But another attack of illness prostrated him, and in April, 1823, he was compelled to send in his resignation.

On regaining, in great measure, his health and strength, he supplied for a time the pulpits of Paradise-Street chapel, Liverpool, and of Cross-Street, Manchester; and, in 1824, he accepted

an invitation to become minister of the congregation recently founded at Todmorden, and consisting chiefly of working men. Here, supported by the cordial co-operation and personal friendship of Mr. Fielden, by whom the congregation had been established, he laboured earnestly and with much success amongst his people, not sparing himself in his devotion to the cause. He used to preach three times every Sunday, and often on a week-day in addition, taught in the Day and Sunday schools, and helped on, in every way he could, the work which depended very much on his own individual exertions. For some time he edited a paper, called “*The Plain Speaker*,” the object of which was to set forth, in a telling and popular form, the principles of a liberal Christianity.

While busily engaged in these various labours, he was seized with malignant typhus fever, and, after a lengthened period of suffering and illness, he found his congregation flagging in their numbers and their zeal; and as he was unable to carry out all the plans which he deemed necessary, he decided at last upon leaving.

Not long after, an invitation came to him to undertake the pastoral charge of the little flock at Northampton, who had left the Castle-Hill meeting on the death of the Rev. John Horsey. He went there, and at once enlisted the interest and won the hearts of the people, and was eminently successful in gathering together an active and united congregation. With his old vigour he gave himself to his work, conducting three services on Sundays and giving lectures in the week. Nor was his interest confined to the special duties of his profession. He entered into matters of public moment, took an active part in liberal politics, and was ready to render any service he was able to the cause of freedom and truth. His bold and effective doctrinal preaching soon involved him in controversy with some of the orthodox ministers of the town, and both by speech and by his pen he proved that he was one who was not easily to be put down either by clamour or by argument. In 1829, he had married a member of his former flock at Bolton, and was now rejoicing in the help and comfort of domestic life. Amongst his people he had formed some strong and enduring attachments. He was happy in witnessing the manifest results of his devoted labours as a pastor and a preacher, and the future seemed full of hope and promise.

Those who knew him in these the best days of his ministry, speak with strong admiration of the singular qualifications he possessed for the work in which he was engaged. His acquaintance in early life with the doctrines reputed orthodox, and the course of thought and study which had led him to adopt a different faith, gave him a great advantage in controversy, making him take a special interest in doctrinal matters, while it fitted him to deal with the questions that would be raised in discussion. His own views were always clear, strong and decided, and his

assertion of them might sometimes be deemed too authoritative and dogmatic, though this was owing simply to the absence of all doubt and uncertainty in his own mind. His was an acute, logical intellect, swift to detect a sophism or an error, and unsparing in exposing it. He was impatient of any dulness or mistiness of thought, and loved the bright, bracing atmosphere of his own reasonable and practical faith. He zealously enforced both the doctrinal and practical aspects of religion, and laboured ever in the might of a strong faith in God and Man, and in Christ as the interpreter of the relation in which the Heavenly Father stands to his children.

Such faith grew only more deep and more spiritual as he grew older; but the power of standing forth as its preacher and example was not to be continued to him in the measure which seemed at first promised.

In the summer of 1832, he met with an accident which was within a very little of proving fatal. On his way from Birmingham, where he had been preaching a charity sermon at the New Meeting, the coach on which he was travelling was almost upset. In reaching forward to save a fellow-passenger whom he saw falling, he lost his balance, and was thrown violently on a heap of stones by the road-side. He sustained a compound fracture of the leg and a dangerous blow on the head. For a fortnight he lay unconscious and on the brink of the grave, from which he was only rescued, under God's blessing, by the great care and skill of the medical men who attended him, and the tender solicitude of his wife and his devoted friends.

With a system shattered and enfeebled by the terrible shock of this accident, and further weakened by an attack of Asiatic cholera, which was then fearfully prevalent, he was yet able after a time to return to his home and his flock at Northampton. But he was no longer equal to the arduous duties which he had hitherto fulfilled so well; and, after much anxious deliberation and doubt of mind, he decided on accepting an invitation to become the successor of the Rev. William Rowe at Derby. There he settled in the year 1834; and for a period of fifteen years he continued his labours, taking as active a part as his health would allow in all good works bearing on the welfare of the town, as well as in matters immediately connected with the congregation. While at Derby, he became a zealous member of the Temperance Society, the principles of which he consistently supported, both by precept and practice, for more than twenty years.

He took a warm interest in the welfare of the little congregations of Unitarian worshipers who assemble in many of the small mining villages of the Peak of Derbyshire. With a few biscuits in his pocket, which he moistened at the mountain streams, he would go on foot from village to village, and, in some wayside

cottage, or in one or the simple and primitive chapels of the district, would gather together the little flock of worshipers, and would feel richly rewarded in the consciousness of having helped them by some word of encouragement and sympathy.

In such ways as these he laboured on, in season and out of season, to do what he could for Christ's sake and the gospel's, and he was often ready to undertake more than his strength would bear. For his constitution had been sorely tried by the several severe illnesses he had gone through, and his nerves never really recovered from the effects of the accident which had so nearly proved fatal. His mental powers had lost much of their early vigour and elasticity. He could not trust himself to preach extempore, as had hitherto been his frequent custom. His memory began to fail him, and his nervous suffering increased. At length, feeling unequal to the duties which devolved upon him at Derby, and depressed by the uncertain prospects of the congregation, which had been deprived, in 1844, of one of its most influential and generous supporters, by the death of Mr. Joseph Strutt, he was thankful, in 1848, to retire to the seclusion of the village of Gateacre, near Liverpool, where his duties would be comparatively light, and he would be released from the calls of public life, for which he found himself increasingly unfitted.

He had not taken this step too soon. Though still able to continue his ministerial labours and attend to the needs of his little flock, he had to do so, often, in much pain and weakness. He was liable to a distressing affection of the head, which, when it came on, would deprive him of consciousness for a minute or two; and frequent nervous headaches and depression of spirits told of some hidden disease, which might probably be traced, in great measure, to the accident of 1832; and he used to express his belief that he should be carried off by some sudden seizure. For the last year or two, however, these painful symptoms had almost left him, and in the evening of his life something of the old bright and ardent spirit seemed restored; and none suspected how soon and how suddenly the change was to come. On Sunday, August 25, he began as usual the service in the little rural chapel at Gateacre, with more than his ordinary vigour and animation. Nearly all who ever attended the worship were gathered together that morning, and it almost seemed as though some secret impulse had brought them there to hear the last words of their pastor and friend. In the opening prayer and scripture lesson, there were the signs, not of failing powers, but of a fervour more impressive than usual. But, in the prayer which followed, his voice began to grow weak and indistinct, and though his thought was still clear and connected, the power of expressing it gradually left him. Yet, even when he could speak no more, his mind was still intent upon the duty before him,

and he pointed to the hymn which he had chosen, making signs that it should be given out. This was done; but his distressed congregation could not go on with the strain, and he was carried home helpless and insensible. A stroke of paralysis had deprived him of the power of speech and motion, and left no hope of his recovery. For three days he lay thus, making no attempt to speak, and apparently in no trouble or pain. And so, at noon, on the 28th of August, his spirit passed away. It was the death he would himself have chosen. He used to quote with sympathy the prayer of Robert Robinson, of Cambridge, that he might die suddenly, silently and alone; and that the summons should have come to him when at his post, and engaged in the sacred duties of the calling he loved so well, and to which he had been from his early youth devoted, seemed indeed a merciful answer to the spirit of his wish and prayer.

His last resting-place is in the pretty rural chapel-yard at the village of Rivington, near Bolton; and the parting offices of friendship were performed by the Rev. Franklin Baker, who was his successor at Bank Street, and, through after years, his true and tried friend.

This sketch of the life of one who was intimately known to a circle of friends and admirers, but who was not prominent before the world, will have its outlines filled up by the affectionate memories of those who learnt the value of his friendship, or the help and support of his pastoral care.

Of his qualifications as a preacher we have already spoken. While explaining and defending the doctrines of Unitarian Christianity, he was always most anxious to set forth the practical lessons of the gospel, and to speak the truth in all things boldly and fearlessly. As a pastor, he was ever ready with help and sympathy for all who were in trouble of any kind; and, in rebuking sin, or interfering on behalf of those who were unkindly or unjustly treated, he never was held back by any thought of personal inconvenience or the fear of making himself unpopular.

While insisting earnestly on the importance of an historical Christianity, with the living personality of Christ at its centre, his main appeal was to the internal evidences of its truth, and he sympathized with any sincere and fervent expression of spiritual religion. What he could not tolerate was any appearance of insincerity and questionable compromise, or any sophistry, either of the intellect or the conscience. The style of his sermons and of the few writings (chiefly controversial pamphlets) which he published, was very clear, pure and simple, and he had no patience with what he considered the affectation and bad taste of many of the popular writers and preachers. He was fond of the works of the old English divines, and took a pleasure in tracing back to the pages of a favourite author some idea which had been put forth now as a discovery or a novelty.

His cultivated and refined taste shewed itself in many ways in his home. He was especially fond of music, of poetry and painting; and his love for all that is fair in the world was to him a source of constant pleasure. He delighted in discovering ever fresh beauties in the ordinary aspects of nature, and, after a solitary ramble in the lanes and fields around his country parsonage at Gateacre, he would speak of some new view he had seen, which he declared to be equal to any renowned landscape; and the day never closed without his looking for some new glory of the setting sun. Nature had ever some fresh delight for him.

In the same way he prized the opportunities of duty and happiness in ordinary life, and found a full satisfaction there, when his enfeebled powers plainly debarred him from the career of greater distinction for which at one time he seemed destined. And though the singular promise of his youth was to be fulfilled only in part, he kept with him a pure and high idea of life in all he did accomplish, and in God's appointed way did his work faithfully and well.

Of his private virtues, his affectionate nature, his tender, devout feeling, which scarcely would ever let him say "Our Father" without emotion, the record is written in the hearts of his family and his friends. Assuredly his memory will be cherished by all who knew what he really was, and many are there who will feel that this brief sketch of his life and character has not exaggerated, but rather has done but partial justice to the early promise, or the degree of its fulfilment in the year of a diligent ministry of the word.

PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH.

SIR,

In your No. for October, it is suggested by your respected correspondent, Mr. Means, that the writer of the article entitled, "Popular Expositions of the Prophecies," should send you a "condensed statement" of the evidence for the later composition of the second part of Isaiah. I regret that I cannot at present comply with this suggestion; and indeed it appears to be scarcely necessary that I should do so, for the satisfaction either of your correspondent or of any other of your readers who may not be able to consult German works on this subject. There are English books in which a very good "condensed statement" will be found. Mr. Higginson, in his "Spirit of the Bible," alludes but slightly to the subject. But a fuller account will be found in Parker's Translation of De Wette on the Old Testament. Dr. Davidson's work on the Old Testament is also a book to be consulted; and there are other English authorities, or books in English, with the enumeration of which I am sure I need not trouble your readers.

INTELLIGENCE.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN UNION.

The autumnal meeting of this society was held at Exeter on Wednesday, October 30, and was fully attended, not only by friends and subscribers in the district, but by visitors from different parts of the kingdom. Divine service was conducted at George's meeting, the introductory part of which was performed by the Rev. J. L. Short, of Bridport. An admirable sermon was preached by the Rev. R. B. Aspland, of Hackney, on the "Signs of the Times." Dinner was provided at the Royal Clarence Hotel, just opposite the venerable cathedral, at which about seventy ladies and gentlemen were present. Spencer Cox, Esq., coroner of the county of Devon, presided. In the course of the afternoon, the usual toasts were given from the chair, and suitable speeches were delivered by the Revds. J. L. Short, R. B. Aspland and Dr. Barham. The time for tea having arrived, it was stated by Rev. Wm. James that other gentlemen were to have spoken, but it was necessary to proceed to the assembly-room of the hotel, to join the friends who would be gathering for the soirée. More than two hundred persons attended, and many others came in after tea. B. P. Pope, Esq., was called to the chair, and appropriately introduced the business of the evening. The Secretary read the report of the Committee, from which it appeared that during the year a missionary station had been formed at Devonport, under the care of Rev. J. Phillips; that missionary journeys had been made into Cornwall; that assistance had been rendered to enable the congregations at Yeovil and Crewkerne to secure the services of a settled minister—Rev. C. Matthews—who, in conjunction with lay assistance, is supplying the pulpits in both these places; that aid had also been given to the ancient society at Warminster to carry on divine worship; that steps had been taken to repair the chapel at Cirencester, which will shortly be re-opened; and that the chapel at Bradford, in Wiltshire, which had been for some time closed, is now filled with worshipers from the humblest classes, collected by the energy and devotedness of a young man, Mr. Edward Grant, who was formerly a local preacher amongst the Wesleyan Methodists, and is now, under the direction of Rev. S. Martin, labouring with much success for the spiritual benefit of his fellowmen. The report entered into details

respecting the condition and prospects of the congregations and institutions in the six Western counties included in the district over which its operations extend, and concluded with hopeful expressions as to the future work of the Christian Union. Rev. H. Knott, of Plymouth, ably moved the adoption of the report, which he thought an excellent epitome of the "signs of the times," to which Mr. Aspland had so well directed their thoughts in the morning. He considered it an instructive, suggestive and interesting document, from which they should derive hope and encouragement.—Mr. Hill seconded the resolution, which was carried.—The appointment of the Committee for the ensuing year was then moved by Rev. C. F. Biss, and seconded by Rev. T. Phillips.—Sir John Bowring, whose first appearance at a public meeting after his long and severe illness was most joyfully welcomed, proposed the thanks of the meeting to Rev. R. B. Aspland for his excellent, seasonable and appropriate sermon, and observed that the indications of progress to which their Rev. friend had referred, were indeed most remarkable as well as delightful, and such as might well cause us to rejoice that we were living in days like these, when, around and abroad, we find so much to animate, to remove doubt, and to drive away despondency and dejection. In speaking of the truth and power of Unitarian views of the gospel, he said, in looking back upon a long and varied life, that his religious faith, which in the day of health was his comfort, had been in the hour of danger and in the presence of death his pillow of repose, and that he rejoiced in the opportunity of bearing his testimony to its value and importance.—The vote of thanks was seconded by Dr. Barham, who also expressed the deep interest he had felt in the discourse of Mr. Aspland, and it was carried by acclamation.—Mr. Aspland thanked the meeting for the kind and cordial manner in which his name had been received, and Sir John Bowring and Dr. Barham for all they had been good enough to say of his services. He said it had been a real pleasure to him to be there, and that, though many changes had taken place in the West of England since he first knew it in early life, he believed there was more activity now than thirty years ago, and that they had ministers and laymen amongst them who knew what was required of them, and who were both able and willing to do it. Mr. As-

pland delivered an eloquent and stirring address on the position of the Unitarian body, referring to the state of theological opinion in the Established Church and in other communions, and concluded by moving, "That this meeting gratefully recognizes in the spirit of the age and the progressive tendencies of other churches cause for encouragement, and a call for greater exertion for the diffusion of Unitarian views of the gospel."—Rev. W. Rowlinson seconded this resolution, and it was passed unanimously.—Rev. J. L. Short then moved, "That whilst deeply deploing the civil war which has arisen in the United States of America, and especially sympathizing with the trials and anxieties of our Unitarian brethren in that country, this meeting devoutly hopes that, by the overruling hand of Divine Providence, the war may issue in the utter overthrow of the system of slavery which has so long darkened the land." He said that, in common with all who contemplated the state of things in America from a Christian point of view, he sincerely lamented this calamitous contest. Their brethren, some of whom had been conspicuous in the noble struggle for humanity which had long been going on in their country, were entitled to our sympathy; and if our words could cheer and sustain them, they should not be withheld. He was sorry that he could not think the Northern States were animated by the desire to overthrow slavery, and the hearts of English philanthropists would not be with them until it was seen that a higher principle was involved in the conflict than the mere preservation of the Union.—John Worsley, Esq., of Bristol, seconded the resolution, and it was carried.—Rev. C. H. A. Dall was called on to speak, and, dwelling as an American on the origin of the war, assured the meeting that the grand issue which underlaid the whole movement [going on in his native land, was indeed the conflict between slavery and freedom.—Rev. William James then moved, "That as the 24th of August in the coming year will be the bicentenary-day of the ejection of the Two Thousand ministers from the Church of England, it is the opinion of this meeting that the day should be celebrated in a manner suitable to the occasion, and in grateful commemoration of the labours and sacrifices by which the cause of truth and freedom has so largely benefited." In recommending this resolution, Mr. James gave a short sketch of the history of the wicked Act of Uniformity, and the consequences with which it was attended; pointed out that to the ejected ministers may be traced the origin of many of our congregations; stated

that the West of England had furnished its share of these venerable confessors; and urged the duty of celebrating the bicentenary-day of their noble testimony on behalf of conscience in a becoming spirit.—Mr. John Murch, of Honiton, seconded the resolution, which was carried with the entire concurrence of the meeting.—Votes of thanks were passed to the choir and to the Chairman, and the day was closed with the general feeling that its proceedings would be long and gratefully remembered.

J.

UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN CHURCH, MELBOURNE, VICTORIA.

A social meeting of the members and friends of the Unitarian Christian church, Eastern Hill, was held on Monday evening, September 16, on occasion of the presentation of a gown to the minister, the Rev. H. Higginson, by the ladies of the congregation. Mr. John Edwards, Jun., M.L.A., took the chair, and briefly opened the business. Mr. Ellis, deputed to act on the ladies' behalf, read the following address, which he introduced by a few brief remarks:—"To the Rev. Henry Higginson. Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned, lady members of your congregation, desire to express our high sense of the great ability with which you conduct the religious services of our church, and to request the favour of your accepting and wearing in the future discharge of those duties the accompanying gown, presented in the names and with the sincerest good wishes of your faithful servants." Twenty-four signatures were appended to the address. Mr. Higginson expressed his sincere pleasure in accepting the handsome present bestowed upon him. It was one of many kind offices done towards him by members of the church within a short period. The use of the gown was becoming more and more prevalent among the denomination, which was also beginning to pay much greater attention than formerly to the appointments for worship, architectural and otherwise. He trusted that ere long something might be done towards the completion of their present unfinished church, the great cost of which, in the dearest days of the colony, had much crippled the resources of the congregation. An anthem followed; and in the course of the evening various pieces of sacred music were effectively performed by the choir of the church, kindly reinforced by several ladies and gentlemen not ordinarily attached to it. Mr. Litolf presided at the harmonium with his usual ability. The meeting being designed to be of a social character, was spent in the most informal manner,—in

conversation, examination of books, stereoscopes, photographs, &c. Fruit and other refreshments were amply done justice to, and the tasteful decoration of the church with flowers, evergreens, &c., gave the whole a very cheerful appearance. The meeting, in number about 120, broke up at half-past ten, apparently well satisfied with the enjoyments of the evening, the arrangements of which were unanimously considered to reflect much credit on the ladies who had superintended them. *From the Herald newspaper.*

UNITARIANISM AT PUDSEY.

On Wednesday, Nov. 6, a new Unitarian church was opened for public worship in this populous district, in the presence of a large and highly respectable congregation, amongst whom were seen many of the leading representatives of the Unitarian cause, both laymen and divines, in the West Riding. A convenient and elegant chapel and a spacious school-room have been erected, and are happily out of debt. The munificent aid of the Unitarians of Leeds and other friends of our cause in the district has brought about this happy result, and is a pregnant proof of the usefulness of the missionary spirit now awakened in many portions of our Zion. The religious services on the occasion were conducted by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, who spoke plainly and earnestly of the duties of Unitarians to their fellow-men and fellow-christians. At a crowded social meeting which followed, James Kitson, Esq., the Mayor of Leeds (since a second time elected by his fellow-townsmen to that honourable office), presided. Mr. James Heywood (supported by the preacher of the day) attended and spoke as a deputation from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. The addresses from Mr. Haigh, the minister of Pudsey, of Rev. Thomas Hincks, Rev. M. Moon, Rev. J. H. Ryland, Rev. Goodwyn Barmby, Mr. Joseph Lupton, Rev. R. L. Carpenter and others, filled up the evening hours most pleasantly. On the following Sunday, the religious services were conducted by Rev. Wm. Gaskell and Rev. R. L. Carpenter, and made a deep impression on large and earnest-minded congregations. But a few years ago, there were but one or two Unitarians (if, indeed, any were known as such) in Pudsey. Let the fact, contrasted with the present state of things, animate our associations and our earnest friends in other parts of the kingdom to meditate and accomplish similar plans of missionary effort and success.

THE SCOTTISH UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

This missionary organization has, by the zeal of Mr. Crosskey, of Glasgow, and Mr. Drummond, of Edinburgh, been revived, and promises to work well for the Unitarian cause in Scotland. Religious services were celebrated and collections made in the Unitarian church at Glasgow on Sunday, Nov. 10, the preacher being Rev. R. Brook Aspland, who was specially deputed to give his aid on the occasion by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Notwithstanding the stormy character of the day, large and deeply-attentive congregations were gathered together to hear an exposition of the moral and spiritual influences of Unitarianism, as well as a defence of some of its leading doctrines. On the following evening, nearly 400 friends of the Unitarian cause assembled in the Queen's Rooms to enjoy a social meeting and to stimulate mutual zeal. Representatives were present from Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Paisley, Girvan, Greenock and other places. Reports were presented from all existing Scottish Unitarian churches, and plans were discussed for the better sustenance and promotion of the Unitarian cause in North Britain. A hopeful spirit animated the friends present. Never, it is believed, were the prospects of liberal Christianity in Scotland more favourable than at the present time. If labourers skilled in the work of Unitarian evangelization, and a little pecuniary help from other quarters, can be obtained, it is believed that much may be done both in strengthening existing churches and in laying foundations for new ones. We would earnestly press the subject upon the consideration of our friends in England, and ask them to send their contributions to Rev. R. B. Drummond (8, Grove Street, Edinburgh), who is the Treasurer of the Mission Fund.

GRAMMAR-SCHOOL TRUSTS—BAKER TESTIMONIAL.

A memorandum, signed by Dr. Southwood Smith and E. N. Dennys, Esq., as Trustees of the fund, has been endorsed on the purchase-deed of land at Kingscote, Wokingham, stating that the greater portion of the money was subscribed and given by the under-mentioned individuals, as a testimonial to Mr. Baker for his great exertions in the conduct of the Ilminster School Appeal, and in obtaining the Act 23 Vict., cap. 11 (Lord Cranworth's Act), which gives the right to Dissenters of being educated in public grammar-schools, and which, in the opinion of eminent jurists, settles the question in favour of the future

eligibility of the parents to be Trustees. Mr. Baker also procured the introduction of the concluding proviso in the fourth section of the subsequent Act, 23 and 24 Vict., cap. 136 (the Charitable Trusts Act,

1860), which provides that "no Trustee shall be removed on the ground only of his religious belief."—The names of all the subscribers are appended to the memorandum.

OBITUARY.

June 18, at Nelson, New Zealand, in his 34th year, Mr. BENJAMIN O. HODGSON, second son of the late Mr. Wm. Hodgson, and grandson of the late Rev. Wm. Tate, of Chorley.

Aug. 9, at Gorse Hall, Cheshire, ANN, daughter of the late Mr. John HIBBERT, of Hyde.

Sept. 22, in her 5th year, ALICE MASON, youngest daughter of Mr. Henry WHITELEGG, of Alderley Edge, and granddaughter of Rev. W. Whitelegge, of Platt.

October 29, at Southampton, aged 75, after a painful illness borne with Christian resignation, Mr. THOMAS JOHNSTON. He was a nephew of Rev. William Johnston, formerly minister of the Presbyterian congregation at Lewes, and belonged to a family several of whom have been the firm and attached friends of civil and religious liberty, and of the cause of Christian truth.

Oct. 29, ANN, widow of the late Francis Aylmer FROST, Esq., of Chester, aged 65.

Nov. 2, at Mill Yard, Goodman's Fields, London, HARRIOT SLATER BLACK, wife of the Rev. William Henry Black, F.S.A., minister of the Seventh-day General Baptist congregation worshiping there. She was the third daughter of the late Rev. William Slater, of the same place, who died in 1819, after thirty-six years' ministry there; and she was descended from worthy and pious ancestors, two of whom were ejected ministers of 1662; another was one of the founders of the meeting-house at Mill Yard, and of the trust estates thereto belonging; and a fourth was one of the celebrated majority at the Salters'-Hall Conference in 1719. She was the last of her family that remained faithful to the religious principles of her ancestors, and was one of the appellants in the celebrated Dissenting cause, argued for three days at the Library in Red-cross Street in 1832, which resulted in the re-establishment of the rights of her ancient congregation; and with her has ended an unbroken series of membership of the Slaters at Mill Yard for 170 years. She was buried at Abney Park, Nov. 7, after an impres-

sive funeral service at Mill Yard, by the Rev. Dr. Sadler, of Hampstead.

W. H. B.

Nov. 5, suddenly, at 9, Orme Square, Bayswater, SAMUEL RIDGE, Esq., aged 76. This amiable and excellent man has thus within a few months followed to the last resting-place the wife whom he sincerely mourned. (See C. R., p. 64.) Educated in the principles of Unitarian Christianity, Mr. Ridge, following the example of his worthy father, bore through life a quiet but uncompromising testimony to his faith. He was during the greater portion of it connected with the Unitarian congregation at Hackney. To the late Rev. Robert Aspland, its pastor for forty years, he was most warmly attached, and the feeling of mutual regard was cemented by a family alliance. The characteristics of Mr. Ridge were good sense, sterling integrity and kindness of heart. In steady attachment to friends, in hospitality, and in the constant performance of the right and kindly deeds which make up a good man's life, probably few of those amongst whom he lived surpassed him. There was in his manner and ordinary trains of thought a geniality and habitual sunshine. Neither unduly elated by prosperity nor depressed by adversity (and he experienced both), he won from all who knew him increased respect and regard. When he felt the infirmities of age coming on him, he leaned with confiding affection on those who knew and loved him for support. It was a pleasing trait in the old man's character that he felt to the last the warmest interest in the society of the young, attracting their sympathy towards himself and rejoicing to minister to their innocent pleasures. Supported by the better hopes of religion, he resigned without a murmur the partner and friend whose affection had been the solace of many years, and met the infirmities of age and the sufferings of decline with true fortitude. He was called to his rest at last suddenly, and in his dying moments was thoughtful and considerate of others, and, though aware of his imminent danger, was calm and self-possessed. A few hours before his death (of the near approach of which there was then no sign), he said with much feeling to an

old and warmly-attached friend, “Thank God, I am at peace with all the world!” The last office of religion and friendship was conducted by the son of his former pastor, who paid to his own and his father’s friend a feeling tribute of respect.

Nov. 8, at Hackney Terrace, Hackney, after a short illness, MARY, relict of James BOWMAN, Esq., whom she followed out of this world within a period of ten months. She was of a Surrey family of the name of Skelton, and was born at Betchworth in 1785 or 1786. In 1810, she married a man of high character and enlarged benevolence, Nathaniel Cogswell, Esq., a merchant who had a large establishment in the Canary Islands. During their residence there, which, with the exception of intervals of considerable duration, lasted from the time of their marriage till 1828, Mrs. Cogswell had experience of the horrors of famine and pestilence. At one time she would gladly have bought bread at a guinea an ounce, and later, while her husband was absent, she had yellow fever, of which three persons had died in her own house. When, in 1828, Mr. and Mrs. Cogswell resolved to take up their abode in America, his native place, the regret of those whom they would leave behind was deep and universal, and it was said the Canary Islands were losing their greatest benefactors. Hitherto Mr. and Mrs. Cogswell had been members of the Church of England; but in the United States they became acquainted with several Unitarian ministers and joined the Unitarian body. We have often heard Mrs. Bowman speak with especial regard and affection of the Revds. — Lunt, W. Ware and Dr. Dewey. In 1832, Mr. Cogswell died, and four years afterwards his widow returned to England, where, in 1837, she married James Bowman, Esq., of whom a short

notice appeared in our No. for March last. They took up their abode at Hackney, where they resided till the time of their death. With a retired disposition, Mrs. Bowman combined great energy and decision of purpose and very warm affections. To those who gave her their confidence and responded to her genial feelings, she was a friend in whom the heart had peace. To the poor she was exceedingly generous, but she always preferred to “do her alms in secret.” From the quiet walks of charity and self-denial, she is gone to those who most loved her and to a better world. Her remains were placed with those of her husband in Abney-Park cemetery.

T. S.

Nov. 9, at Southsea, near Portsmouth, MRS. SIME, aged 24.

Nov. 18, at Mount Pleasant, Newport, Isle of Wight, GEORGE KIRKPATRICK, Esq., aged 68.

Nov. 18, aged 28, greatly beloved and deeply lamented, MARY ANNE, youngest daughter of George and Mary FILLITER, of Trigon Hill, near Wareham, Dorset.

Nov. 19, suddenly, at Wareham, Dorset, Rev. MAXWELL DAVIDSON, aged 55, pastor of the Unitarian church in that town. Of this estimable and lamented man, as well as of some others whose death it is our painful office this month to record, we hope hereafter to give some biographical particulars.

Nov. 19, of typhus fever, KATE, youngest daughter of Robert PINNOCK, Esq., of Newport, Isle of Wight, aged 13.

Nov. 20, at Devonport, THOS. C. GOULD, Esq., aged 38.

MARRIAGES.

Oct. 16, at the Unitarian chapel, Tenterden, by Rev. Edward Talbot, WILLIAM HENRY TALBOT, of Lower Broughton, Manchester, second son of the late Mr. John Talbot, of Leeds, to MARIA EMMA, only daughter of the late James WINSER, Jun., Esq., Tenterden.

Nov. 3, at the Unitarian chapel, Belper, by Rev. Rees L. Lloyd, Mr. ISAAC NEEDHAM to Miss FRANCES TAYLOR, all of Belper.

Nov. 5, at the Unitarian church, Stourbridge, by Rev. David Maginnis, ALFRED FELLOWS, Esq., of Victoria, Vancouver’s Island, second son of Isaac Fellows, Esq.,

of Wolverhampton, to Lucy, daughter of the late John MORGAN, Esq., of Hay, Brecknockshire.

Nov. 6, at Hyde chapel, Gee Cross, by Rev. Charles Beard, B.A., JOHN STANLEY, Esq., of Adswood, near Stockport, to Mrs. HARRIET S. HICK, late of Manor House, Woodley, near Stockport.

Nov. 13, at Upper Brook-Street chapel, Manchester, by Rev. William Gaskell, M.A., GEORGE, eldest son of Mr. James PAYNE, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, to ANN, fourth daughter of Mr. John HILL, machinist, Ardwick.

GENERAL INDEX.

Aberdare, opening of Unitarian church at, 60.
Abrahám, Michael de Szent, of Transylvania, 524.
Academical honours of Priestley, 42.
Acts xx. 28, 12—iv. 24—30, 23—iii. 21, 92—ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16, 219—vii. 59, 220, 409—vii. 56, 220.
Aikin, Rev. Dr., 686, 732.
Aikin, Miss, on society at Warrington, 735.
Ainsworth, Mr. E. C., obituary of, 320.
Ainsworth, Mrs., obituary of, 448.
Alcock, Miss Mary, obituary of, 128.
Alexandrine Codex (1 Tim. iii. 16), 13.
Allen's Hebrew Men and Times, 596.
Alsop, Mr. James, obituary of, 511.
America, disunion and war in, 633, 695.
American Unitarian Association, 380.
Anderson, William, a fugitive slave, case of, 101.
Antiphonal character of sacred song, 16.
Arianism, 274.
Armitage, Miss Betty, obituary of, 638.
Arnanld, Jacqueline, story of, 163.
Artemon on the early prevalence of Unitarian doctrine, 669.
Ashdowne, Rev. R., obituary of, 512.
Ashton's, Mr. Thos., speeches at Flowery Field, 252, 253.
Ashurst, James, ejected minister, at Newington Green, 30.
Athens and the world's literature, 174.
Austoo, James and Margery, martyrs at Islington, 27.
Australia, Unitarianism in South, 382, 576. Unitarian church, Melbourne, 758.
Bache's, Rev. Samuel, Lecture on Bible Inspiration, 372. On scripture and science, 590.
Bacup, primitive state of society at, 241.
Badger, Mr. William, obituary of, 511.
Baker, Miss, obituary of, 384, 442.
Baker, Miss Bertha, obituary of, 511.
Bakewell, Rev. W. J., obituary of, 639.
Balston, Mrs. Alfred, obituary of, 319.
Bardesanes and Ephrem the Syrian, 85.
Bayley, Mr. C. J., obituary of, 256.
Beard, Dr., on the hymnology of the Christian church, 15, 80, 133, 289, 398, 462, 538. Speech at Flowery Field, 254. Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, reviewed, 505. Sermons on Religion and Science, 657.
Beard's, Rev. Charles, Port Royal, reviewed, 160, 306. Speech at Flowery Field, 253. Sermon before Unitarian Association, 373, 435.
Belfast Unitarian Society, Report of, 633.
Believing and Living, by Dr. Huntington, reviewed, 146.
Believing in spite of failure, 312.
Bellows, Rev. H. W., letter of, 313.
Bennet, Mr. J., of Newington Green, 37.
Bereans, the, 621.
Bersier, M. Eugene, on the Evangelical Alliance, 721.
Bicknell's, Mr. Elhanan, munificent donation to the Unitarian Association, 378.
Binns', Rev. W., speech at Chester, 57.
Birmingham riots, 74.
Biscoe, Richard, of Newington Green, conformed, 38.
Bishops, their vote on Atterbury's attainder, 40. Manifesto on Essays and Reviews, 201.
Black, Mrs., obituary of, 760.
Boardman, Mr. Wm., obituary of, 384.
Bolingbroke's hostility to Christianity, 183.
Bolton, Bank Street, congregation, 751.
Bonner's, Bishop, cruelties, 28.
Book of Good Counsels, 605.
Bostock, Mrs., obituary of, 703.
Boult, Mr. Peter, obituary of, 639.
Bowman, Mrs., obituary of, 64.
Bowman, Mr. James, obituary of, 192.

Bowman, Mrs., obituary of, 761.
 Bowring, Sir John, on the weakened influence of the Church, 129. Channing, a sonnet, 551. Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, 656. Good Samaritan, 594. Slavery, 731.
 Bowring, Lady, lines by, 621.
 Boyce, Miss, obituary of, 639.
 Bragge, Rev. Robert, 559.
 Bridgman, Laura, 565.
 Bright's, Mr. H. A., Account of Warrington Academy, 682, 732.
 Brock, Rev. G. B., testimonial to, 254.
 Browning's, Mrs., poetry, 694.
 Buckle's History of Civilization, Vol. II., reviewed, 449.
 Bunyan and his critics, 208.
 Burton, Mr. J., obituary of, 639.
 Bute, Lord, and the "King's Friends," 68, 69.
 Buxton services, 440.
 Buzogány, Mr., translates Mr. Tagart's Sermons, 523.

C., R. L., on fugitive slave law, 100.
 Calvin and Servetus, 54.
 Campbell, Dr., hoax on, 576.
 Canada and fugitive slaves, 101.
 Canton papers, 44.
 Carmarthen Academy, 437, 696.
 Carpenter's, Rev. R. L., address to the Home Missionary Board students, 142.
 Carter, Miss, obituary of, 384.
 Carter-Lane chapel, closing service, 698.
 Channing, a sonnet, 551.
 Chants, Hymns and Anthems, objected to, 138.
 Cheetham, Miss, obituary of, 128.
 Chester, congregational tea-meeting at, 57.
 Christian Sower, a Transylvanian periodical, 523.
 Christianity eternal, 531.
 Church of Rome, its weakened influence, 129.
 Church-rate question, 184.
 Churchill, Mr. M., obituary of, 192.
 Clarke, Rev. S. F., obituary of, 637.
 Clayton, Rev. Dr., 738.
 Cleator, list of preachers and subjects at, 575.
 Clegg, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 128.
 Clergy of the eighteenth century, 71.
 Codex Cantabrigiensis, antiquity of, 15.
 Codex Sinaiticus, Tischendorf's, account of, 1.
 Colani, Rev. T., of Strasburg, 365.
 Coloss. iii. 16, 17, 20.
 Constantine, the emperor, 330.
 Cooke, Mr. Thos., obituary of, 319, 383.
 Coquerel, Athanase, Jun., on the Evangelical Alliance, 612, 716, 722.
 Coquerel, Stephen, on the Evangelical Alliance, 672.

1 Cor. xiv. 15—26, 19—v. 1—10, 92—i. 2, 220.
 Corrupt doctrine in theology, how it progresses, 80.
 Cotton, Stephen, a martyr, scourged by Bonner, 28.
 Cotton, Dr., 558.
 Courtauld's Psalms, Hymns and Anthems, 56.
 Courtauld, Mr. George, obituary of, 320.
 Coventry and ministry of Rev. Timothy Davis, 272.
 Cowper's, Mr. B. H., Syriac Miscellanies, 371.
 Cox, Samuel, of Newington Green, 34.
 Crook, near Durham, opening of a Unitarian church at, 185.
 Cumming's, Dr., abuse of prophecy, 519.

Dall, Mr., and the East-Indian mission, 187, 255, 381. His criticisms on Unitarian Association, &c., 574.
 Davidson, Rev. Maxwell, obituary of, 761.
 Davies, Mr. Theophilus, obituary of, 704.
 Davies, Dr., one of the Marian exiles, 501.
 Davis, Mr. J. B., on physical peculiarities of ancient Hebrews, 49.
 Davis, Rev. David, of Castle Howell, 209, 628.
 Davis, Rev. Timothy, of Evesham, obituary of, 64. Memoir of, 209, 272.
 Davis, Rev. David, of Neath, 210.
 Davis, John, army surgeon, notice of, 275.
 Davis, Rev. Benjamin, of Evesham, 275.
 Davis, Marion, obituary of, 384.
 Derby congregation, 753.
 Doddridge, Dr., ecclesiastical proceedings against, 552.
 Domestic Mission Reports, 632.
 Doncaster, Mr. Elliot's lectures at, 63, 127.
 Doubtless, Mrs., obituary of, 384.
 Drummond's, Rev. R. B., Lecture on Essays and Reviews, 632.

Eagleton, Mr., controverted by Rev. John Kentish, 277.
 Eastern Unitarian Christian Society, 510.
 East-Indian Unitarian Mission, 187.
 Edinburgh preachers a century ago, 424.
 Edinburgh Review, 692.
 Educational Minute of the Committee of Privy Council, 695.
 Emans, Rev. Peter, of Coventry, 212.
 Encyclopædia Britannica, reviewed, 54.
 End of the world anticipated, 91.
 Enfield, Rev. Dr., 736.
 Eph. i. 12—v. 18, 19.
 Ephrem the Syrian, 85. Margarita of, 539.

Epistle to the Ephesians, to whom sent, 11.

Erbury, Mr. William, 502.

Essays and Reviews, 185, 200.

Essenes, the, and Jesus Christ, 99.

Evangelical Alliance at Geneva, 612, 672, 716.

Evans, Mrs., obituary of, 191.

Evesham, 276, 278, 284.

Exodus xv. 21, 16.

Exted's painting of the Birmingham rioters, 43.

Fairbairn, Mr. William, tribute to, by Lord Wrottesley, 625.

Falcon, Mrs. Charles, obituary of, 442.

Fate, Emerson on, 131.

Fawcett, Dr., of Ewood Hall, and his school, 237.

Ferencz, Mr., of Transylvania, 523.

Field's, Rev. William, letter to Rev. Timothy Davis, 214.

Filliter, Miss Mary Anne, obituary of, 761.

Flowery Field, Unitarian church at, 252.

Fogg, Mr. George, obituary of, 442.

Forster, Rev. William, and his congregation, 63.

Fox, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 511.

Fox's, C. J., motion for repeal of Test and Corporation Acts, 78.

Frost, Mrs. Botteril, obituary of, 319.

Frost, Mrs., obituary of, 760.

Fugitive slaves, can England protect them? 100.

Fullagar's, Rev. John, retirement from active duty, 255.

Funeral Song-book, Transylvanian, 522.

Gale, Theophilus, on Jansenism, 311.

Gaskell's, Rev. W., Sermon on the Duties of Congregations, 116. Sermon on God's Witness to Himself in the World, 623.

Gateacre congregation, 754.

General Baptist Assembly, London, 379.

Geneva pastors' rebuke of the Evangelical Alliance, 612.

George III., character and reign of, 67, 69, 496.

Gittins, Mr. James, obituary of, 384.

Good Samaritan, by Sir John Bowring, 595.

Gordon's, Rev. John, speech at Flowery Field, 252. Sermon at Coventry, 574.

Gould, Mr. T. C., obituary of, 761.

Grahame, Major, obituary of, 702.

Grammar-school trusts, 759.

Grimshaw, Mr. John, obituary of, 512.

Grisbrook, Mr. Joseph, obituary of, 703.

Grotz, M., of Nismes, 367.

Grundy, Mr. Joseph, obituary of, 191.

Hale, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 639.

Hale's, Mr. E. E., Ninety Days' Worth of Europe, 180.

Hall, Rev. Edward, obituary of, 192, 441.

Hallel, of the Passover, 18.

Harding, Mrs., obituary of, 191.

Hart, Miss Betsey, obituary of, 702.

Hase's Life of Jesus, reviewed, 175.

Hatch, Mr. Thomas, obituary of, 384.

Heber's hymn, "Incarnate Word," referred to, 225.

Hebrew Men and Times, 596.

Hebrews, physical peculiarities of the ancient, 49.

Hennell's, Miss, Prize Essay on the End of the World, 91.

Herford's, Rev. Brooke, Tracts, 629. Home Page Tract Fund, 689.

Hewling family, early members of Newington-Green congregation, 30.

Hibbert, Miss, obituary of, 760.

Higginson's, Rev. Edward, letter on Essays and Reviews, 200.

Hitopadesa, or Book of Good Counsels, 605.

Hodgson, Mr. B. O., obituary of, 760.

Holland, Rev. T. C., obituary of, 512.

Holt, Mr. George, obituary and memoir of, 192, 230, 257, 336.

Holt, Mr., of Warrington, 685, 688, 737.

Hopps, Rev. J. Page, on the Doncaster congregation, 127. His Lectures and Thoughts, 690.

Hoskins, Captain, obituary of, 192.

Howard, John, an Independent, 40.

Howe, Dr. Samuel G., the philanthropist, 559.

Hughes, Dr. William, Bishop of St. Asaph, 489.

Hungarian Bible, 526.

Hunter, Rev. Joseph, obituary of, 384, 444.

Huntington's, Dr. F. D., conversion to Trinitarianism, 146.

Hutton, Dr., on worshiping Jesus as God, 90. His Sermons, reviewed, 497.

Hutton, Mr. William, obituary of, 638.

Hymnology of the Christian church, 15, 80, 133, 216, 225, 227, 350, 398.

Hymns and Psalms of Transylvanian Unitarians, 521.

Hymns for Mothers and Children, 179.

Igglesden's, Commander, Ocean Sprays, 631.

Illustrated News on Essays and Reviews, 204.

Ilsley, Miss, obituary of, 704.

India Mission, 255, 381, 510.

Inhospitability in a Unitarian chapel, 382.

Isaiah 1. 4, 513—li.—lv., lvii.—lix., 514, lxi., lxiv., lxv. 5—8, 517.

Isaiah, the latter part of, written during the captivity in Babylon, 514, 622.

Prophecies of, 756.

Islington, references to its religious history, 27. Opening of new school-room at, 62.

J. on Nature and God, in reply to N. K. N., 113.

Jackson, Mr. Robert, obituary of, 384.

Jackson, Miss, obituary of, 703.

Jansen's *Augustinus* and the five propositions, 165.

Jeremiah xiii. 23—25, xlvii. 6, 7, 517.

Jevons, Mr. J. E., obituary of, 191.

John viii. 1—11, 12—i. 18, 13.

1 John v. 7, 13.

Johns, Mrs. John, obituary of, 384.

Johnston, Mr. Thomas, obituary of, 760.

Johnston, Mrs. Thomas, obituary of, 384.

Jones, Rev. Noah, 639. Memoir of, 748.

Katechesis, Transylvanian, 521.

Kell, Mr. C. A., obituary of, 384.

Kell's, Rev. Edmund, Lecture on Watts, 371.

Kent, Duchess of, obituary of, 256.

Kentish's, Rev. John, review of Mr. Egleton's sermon, 277.

Kirkland, Dr., of Boston, 588.

Kirkpatrick, Mr. Geo., obituary of, 761.

Kirkus's, Rev. W., Difficulty of Understanding the Bible, 368.

Knowles, Miss, obituary of, 256.

Knox, Rev. Alexander, on Pascal, 312.

Kriza, John, the Bishop of Transylvania, edits the "Sower," 523.

L. on Rev. F. D. Maurice's opinions, 247.

Lamdin, Mrs. Elizabeth, obituary of, 384.

Lamson, Dr., on the worship of Christ, 140.

Latin the language for intercommunication between scholars, 529.

Lavoisier and Priestley, 42.

Le Fevre, Rev. C. F., letter of, to Bishop of Canada, 186.

Le Lien, translations from, 612, 672, 716.

Le Neve, Peter, and his religious opinions, 617.

Le Tellier, the Jesuit, 311.

Lee, Samuel, of Newington Green, and his works, 31.

Leech, Mr. John, obituary of, 320.

Leigh, Miss Ellen, obituary of, 442.

Leigh, Mrs. Frances, obituary of, 703.

Leigh, Mrs. Peter, obituary of, 639.

Leighton, Archbishop, 693.

Leslie, Sir John, and the chair of Mathematics, 694.

Lewin, Mr. Thos. Fox, obituary of, 448.

Liberty and religion, 535.

Liverpool, political and other changes in, 259, 271.

Lloyd's, Rev. Dr., address at Carmarthen Academy, 696.

Locke translates Nicole's three Essays, 308.

Lord's Prayer, poetical paraphrase of, 656.

Love, Mr. John, obituary of, 702.

Luke xxii. 43, 44, xxiv. 51, 12—xx. 42, 16—ii. iii., 21, 22.

Lydgate, Brief History of the Chapel at, 503.

M., J. C., memoir of Rev. C. P. Valentine, 316.

Macaulay, Lord, 692.

Macdonald's Lecture on Essays and Reviews, 632.

Mace, Henry, obituary of, 384.

Mackie's, Mr. Ald., speech at Flowery Field, 254.

Macnaught's, Rev. John, resignation of his incumbency, 705.

Madge's, Rev. Thomas, address to students of Manchester New College, 472.

Madox, Isaac, Bishop of Worcester, 40.

Manchester New College, annual meeting of Trustees, 117. And political economy, 174, 246, 247. Examination, 509. Honours obtained by students of, 655.

Manchester District Unitarian Association, 248.

Manchester Sunday-School Union, 250.

Mann's, Mr. Horace, Life of S. G. Howe, 559.

Manton, Dr. Thomas, 28.

Mara and Marat at Warrington, 739.

Mardon's, Rev. Benj., copies of Priestley's letters, 46.

Marl i. 12—xiv. 26, 18.

Marriages, 128, 190, 256, 320, 384, 448, 512, 640, 761..

Martineau, Rev. James, criticised by Miss Hennell, 98. His Hymn-book criticised by Dr. Beard, 135. In reply to Dr. Beard, on the hymns of the church, 216, 350, 669. On the study of political economy in Manchester New College, 246.

Martineau, Miss, on Health, Husbandry and Handicraft, 177.

Martineau, Miss Ellen, obituary of, 639.

Mason, Mrs. Joseph, obituary of, 704.

Massey's History of England, Vols. I.—III., 65.

Matthew vi. 13, 12—xxvi. 30, 18.

Matthews, Mrs. Wm., obituary of, 384.

Maurice, Rev. F. D., not a Unitarian, 187, 217.

Means, Rev. J. C., on prophecies of Isaiah, 622.

Mechanics' Institute of Liverpool, 337.

Ministers' Stipend Augmentation Society, 344.

Miracle and the mind of Christ, 663.

Miriam's song, 15.

M' Master, Rev. A. H., ordination of, 251.
 Montgomery's, Rev. J. K., speeches at Chester, 57, 59.
 Montgomery's, Rev. Dr., rebuke to Mr. M' Alister, 632.
 Morehouse's, Mr. H. J., History of Lydgate Chapel, 503.
 Morison's Disquisitions and Notes on Matthew's Gospel, reviewed, 175.
 Morning hymn of the primitive church, 222.
 Morton, Mr. Chas., of Newington Green, 34.
 N. K. N.'s criticism on a passage on Nature and God, 51, 171. J. in reply to, 113.
 Nagy, Lewis, one of the editors of the Transylvanian "Sower," 523.
 Nantwich chapel and house, 41.
 Nash, Miss, obituary of, 384.
 National Reformer on Essays and Reviews, 203.
 National Review on Nature and God, 51, 113. On Essays and Reviews, 205.
 New, Mr. John, obituary of, 128.
 Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Church of the Divine Unity, anniversary of, 313.
 Newington-Green congregation, early history of, 27.
 Newington, Stoke, reference to religious history of, 28. Independent congregation of, 30.
 Newton, Mr. John, obituary of, 702.
 Nicæa, Council of, 325.
 Nicole, Pierre, 307.
 Nicon the patriarch, 334.
 Northampton, social meeting at, 123. Congregation, 752.
 Northumberland, U.S., Priestley's house at, 47.
 Nuttall, Mr. William, obituary of, 511.
 Nye, Mr. James, on Universal Restoration, 632.
 Obituary notices, 64, 128, 191, 256, 316, 383, 441, 511, 637, 702.
 Oldbury double lecture, 636.
 Oliver, Mrs., obituary of, 192.
 Orders in Council of 1812, 195.
 Osler, Mr. Thomas, obituary of, 128. Memoir of, 193.
 Owen, Dr. Charles, prosecution of, 557. And family, 628.
 Owen's, Rev. John, removal to Whitby, 64.
 Paget's, Mr. John, letter, 373.
 Paget's, Mr., Criticisms on Macaulay, 692.
 Paradol, M. Prevost, on Protestantism, &c., 385.
 Parr, Rev. Dr., 272.
 Parsons, Life of Chief Justice, 577.
 Pascal, Blaise, 165.
 Passover hymns, Jewish and Christian, 18.
 Paul of Samosata, 223, 543.
 Pavillon, the Port Royalist, 309.
 Perkins, H. D., obituary of, 192.
 Petition against church-rates, 377.
 Philadelphia, Unitarianism in, 313.
 Phillips, Mr. Aldcroft, obituary of, 511.
 Phipson's wax model of Priestley, 42.
 Pierre, M. Grand, on the Trinity, 724.
 Pinnock, Miss Kate, obituary of, 761.
 Pinnock, Mrs. Robert, obituary of, 703.
 Pitt, William, 79.
 Pliny's "Carmen Christo quasi Deo," 81, 221, 541, 546, 671.
 Political economy and Manchester New College, 174, 246, 247.
 Port Royalists, the, 160, 306.
 Porter's, Rev. J. S., sermon at Southampton, 633.
 Potter's, Mr. Edmund, speech at Flowery Field, 254.
 Pountney, Mrs. H. W., obituary of, 639.
 Powell, Vavasor, life of, 567.
 Practical piety, 604.
 Pratt, Archdeacon, on Scripture and Science, 591.
 Prayer to Christ in Unitarian worship, 289, 398, 462, 538.
 Press of Transylvania, 525.
 Price, Dr., on true Christian worship, 89. At Newington Green, 427.
 Price, Rev. Samuel, 559.
 Prichard, Rees, 501.
 Priestley, Dr. Joseph, memorials of, 41. Silhouette of, 41. Coat-of-arms of, 48. And the Birmingham riots, 73, 78. At Warrington, 733.
 Progress of Religious Thought, reviewed, 365.
 Prophecies, Popular Exposition of the, 513.
 Protestantism in France, 533.
 Provincial Letters of Pascal, 169.
 Provincial Assembly at Gee Cross, 438.
 Psalm cxiii.—cxviii. 18—xvii. 7, 19—cxxvii., 515—lxxxix. 1—8, 517.
 Pudsey, Unitarianism at, 759.
 Quarterly Review on Essays and Reviews, 203.
 Rees, Rev. Thomas, History of Nonconformity in Wales, 499, 567, 626.
 Rees, Dr. Abraham, 273.
 Religion and science, 657.
 Renan, M., 367. On the future of religious societies, 385, 479, 530.
 Rev. iv. 10, 11, 23—i. 17, iv. 11, v. 9, xv. 3, 24.
 Revelation, Song of the Lamb in, 220.
 Reville, Dr. Albert, of Rotterdam, 366.
 Ridge, Mr. Samuel, obituary of, 760.

Ridge, Mrs. Ruth, obituary of, 64.
 Robertson, Rev. F. W., on the Christianity of the Sermon on the Mount, 145.
 Rochdale, annual tea-meeting at Clover Street, 121. Unitarian chapel at, 343. Rom. x. 13, 14, 220, 411.
 Rough, John, martyr of Islington, 28.
 Rowan, Archibald Hamilton, 744.
 Ruins of houses in Birmingham destroyed in the riots, 42.
 Russell, Mr. J., of Newington Green, 37.
 Russian Church history, 333.
 Ryland, Rev. J. H., on miracle and the mind of Christ, 663.
 Ryley, Mr. Jacob, obituary of, 512.

Sadler, Miss Elizabeth, obituary of, 512.
 Salesbury, Wm., translates New Testament into Welsh, 500.
 Salvador's Paris, Rome and Jerusalem, 385.
 1 Sam. xviii. 7, 16.
 Saturday Review on the new Bishops, 63. On M. Renan, 385.
 Scherer, Dr. Edmund, 367.
 Scholten, Dr., of Leyden, 367.
 Schwann, Mr. Henry, obituary of, 702.
 Scott, Rev. Thomas, of Norwich, 558.
 Scottish Presbyterianism, 693, 694.
 Scottish Unitarian Association, 759.
 Scripture and science, 591.
 Seddon, Rev. John, letter of, 44. At Warrington, 682, 688, 733, 736, 744.
 Servetus and Calvin, 54.
 Shakspere's religion, 56.
 Shannon, Mrs., obituary of, 384.
 Sharp, Archbishop, 693.
 Sharpe, Mr. Frederick, obituary of, 384.
 Sheffield, tidings of the Birmingham riots at, 43.
 Short's, Rev. J. L., sermon before Baptist Assembly, 631.
 Sime, Mrs., obituary of, 761.
 Slavery, a sonnet, by Sir J. Bowring, 731.
 Smith, Dr. Adam, on the Atonement, 620.
 Smith, Rev. Edwin, ordination of, at Manchester, 115.
 Solly, Rev. Henry, on the Atonement, reviewed, 416.
 Somerville, Dr., Life and Times of, 423.
 Sothern, Mr. George, obituary of, 128.
 Sothern, Mrs. Samuel, obituary of, 702.
 Southampton, historical associations with, 571.
 Southern Unitarian Society, 633.
 Spyridion, the Shepherd Bishop of Cyprus, 328.
 Squire, Mrs., obituary of, 128.
 St. Francis de Sales, 163.
 Stanley's, Professor A. P., Eastern Church, reviewed, 321.
 Stanley, Rev. G. H., 576.

Stansfeld, Mrs. T. W., obituary of, 448.
 Starkey, Rev. J., of Newington Green, 36.
 Stephen's invocation of Christ, 220.
 Stevens, Mrs. Robert, 384.
 Stowell's, Canon, Sermon on Science, 657.
 Street's, Rev. J. C., lecture on Unitarianism, 631.
 Sunday blessings of, 271.
 Sunday-school directors' conference at Manchester, 123.
 Székely's, Rev. Moses, letter to Rev. J. J. Tayler, 375.

T.'s account of the Codex Sinaiticus, 1. Memoir of Mr. Thomas Osler, 193.
 Tagart, Rev. Edward, memorial of the late, 701.
 Taylor's, Rev. J. J., ordination charge, 115. Letter to Rev. Moses Székely and the reply, 374, 375. Account of books sent from Transylvania, 493, 521. Address at the opening of Manchester New College session, 641.
 Taylor, Dr. John, of Norwich, 686, 732.
 Taylor, Mrs. Arthur, obituary of, 384.
 Tennant, Mr. James, obituary of, 639.
 Thacher, Rev. S. C., 589.
 Theology, need of honesty and fearlessness in, 644.
 Thom, Rev. J. H., on Dr. Beard's criticism on hymnology, 225, 290. Funeral sermon for Mr. Geo. Holt, 347.
 Thompson, Mr. George, obituary of, 256.
 Thompson, Dr. Henry, obituary of, 448.
 Tillemont, character of, 308.
 1 Tim. iii. 16, 13.
 "Times," a cheering note from the, 63.
 Tipping, Anne and Mary, obituary of, 639.
 Tischendorf's journeys in search of manuscripts, 2.
 Todmorden congregation, 752.
 Transylvanian religious history, 493.
 Unitarian books, account of, 493, 521.
 Tribe, Mr. John, obituary of, 320.
 Trowbridge, Judge, 579.
 Turnbull, Rev. Joseph, obituary of, 638.

Unitarian Association, anniversary meeting of, 315, 373.
 Unitarian character of scripture hymns, 23, 27.
 Unitarian Herald, 315.
 Unitarian Home Missionary Board, annual examination of, 124.
 Unitarian missions in Lancashire and Cheshire, 700.
 Unitarian sermons and pamphlets, reviewed, 631.
 Unitarianism, revivers in England of, 88. Of Dr. Watts's closing days, 573. In Australia, 576. At Pudsey, 759.

Universities in England and America, 181.
 Unsworth, Mrs. Peter, obituary of, 512.
 Upperthorpe chapel, Sheffield, opening of, 507.
 V. on prophecies of Isaiah, 756.
 Valentine, Rev. C. P., obituary memoir of, 316.
 Vaughan, Mr. Samuel, 742.
 Vaughan, Mr. B., 743.
 Vidler, Rev. William, obituary of, 319.
 Wakefield, Rev. Gilbert, 738.
 Walker, Rev. George, 737.
 Wansey, Mrs., obituary of, 128.
 Warrington, house of Priestley at, 41.
 Academy, account of, 682, 732.
 Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society, 574.
 Watson, Mr. John, obituary of, 639.
 Watson, Mrs. T. C., obituary of, 319.
 Watts, Dr., autograph letter of, 557.
 Life and character of, 571.
 Welby's, Horace, *Mysteries of Life, Death and Futurity*, 182.
 Wellbeloved, Rev. C., on the object of Christian worship, 89. On the missionary labours of students, 142.
 Western Unitarian Christian Union, 757.
 West-of-England Unitarian Book and Tract Society, 440.
 Whitelegge on the Mind of Christ, 632.
 Whitelegge, Miss A. M., obituary of, 760.
 Whittaker, Mr. Ernest, obituary of, 128.
 Wickins, Mr. William, of Newington Green, 36.
 Wicksteed's, Rev. C., speech at Chester, 59.
 Williamson, Mrs., obituary of, 128.
 Willoughby, Lord, of Parham, 746.
 Withers' Poems, reviewed, 370.
 Wood, Isaac, obituary of, 638.
 Worthington, Miss Albina, obituary of, 639.
 Wright, Rev. John, on Mr. Martineau's Hymn-book, 227, 289.
 Wymondley Academy, 749.
 Yates, Mr. James, additional memorials of Priestley, 41. On reverence for Christ and its limits, 90. On physical peculiarities of the Jews, 173. On political economy and Manchester New College, 247.
 Yates, Rev. John, original letter of, 619.
 York, renovation of St. Saviourgate chapel, 120.

MR. 13. cth

HIBBERT TRUST.

FIFTH REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES.

25TH JUNE, 1861.

THE Trustees are glad to be able to announce that they have elected four gentlemen as Hibbert Scholars since the publication of the last Report on June 21st, 1859. The examination for 1859 resulted in the election of Mr. William Chatterton Coupland and Mr. Joseph Dare, and Mr. Edward Samuel Howse and Mr. Alexander Gordon were elected in 1860. These gentlemen were all students of Manchester New College, and they continue to hold their Scholarships at the present time.

The Rev. Edwin Smith, who was elected in 1859 as the first Fellow under the Trust, has just ceased to hold his Fellowship in consequence of his appointment, during the past half-year, as minister of the Upper Brook-street Chapel, Manchester. The Trustees have marked their sense of the ability displayed by Mr. Smith, during his connection as Scholar and Fellow with the Trust, by making a grant of £20 for the purchase of books likely to be useful to him, and they accordingly presented upwards of fifty volumes to him on his settlement at Manchester. Mr. Upton continues

to hold the Scholarship to which he was elected in 1858, and he has this day been elected a Fellow—the Fellowship to commence on the termination of his Scholarship at Christmas next.

The half-yearly Reports of the Fellow and Scholars, during the past two years, have been satisfactory.

At the date of the last Report, the claims of the Trustees for a return of all property-tax charged upon the income of the Trust were under the consideration of the Special Commissioners of Income Tax. The Trustees are now glad to state, that in consequence of the charitable and educational objects of the foundation the duty hitherto charged has been repaid by the Commissioners, and that the income of the Trust will in future be relieved from the tax.

The attention of the Trustees has been frequently directed, during the past two years, to the question of transferring a portion, at least, of the capital of the Trust fund from the American securities, in which it has stood since the date of the Trust deed, to others in this country, and they have endeavoured to avail themselves of every opportunity which has offered itself for obtaining from America the repayment of principal. They have, however, as yet been unsuccessful in removing any portion of the fund from the securities in which it was left by Mr. Hibbert; and looking to the state of affairs in America, there appears at present but little probability of their being able to do so. It is right, perhaps, to state, that they have not, as yet, had reason to complain of any irregularity or delay in the payment of dividends or interest on these securities.

In the course of the year 1860, the Committee of Management were requested by the Trustees to consider and report whether any regulation could be usefully framed for granting Scholarships to young ministers who should chiefly devote themselves to local missionary labours, under the special

superintendence of the minister of the Anti-Trinitarian congregation of the locality, but the reference was subsequently discharged, in accordance with the opinion of the Committee, that the demands on the Trust funds rendered it unadvisable then further to consider the subject. No change has been made in any of the regulations of the Trust during the past two years.

It was stated in the last Report that the Trustees had passed a regulation to the effect that no part of the Trust funds should be devoted towards the personal expenses of any Trustee incurred in attending the meetings of the Trust. In consequence of a doubt felt by some of the Trustees, whether, looking to the provisions of the Trust Deed, the Trustees had power to pass such a regulation, the opinion of counsel has been taken on the subject. The result justifies the view previously taken by the majority of the Trustees, that it was Mr. Hibbert's object to leave every detail of the Trust and of its management as open and flexible as possible, and that the matter in question may be decided as the Trustees shall, in the fair exercise of their discretion, think proper.

The Trustees have lost the assistance of Mr. Coffin and Mr. Price, as members of the Trust, owing to their inability to attend the meetings as often as the regulations require. Two other Trustees, Mr. Ainsworth and Mr. Grundy, have resigned. The vacancy existing at the date of the last Report, through the resignation of Mr. Worthington, was filled up in December, 1859, by the election of Jerom Murch, Esq., of Cranwells, near Bath. In place of Messrs. Ainsworth and Coffin, the Trustees have elected Timothy Rhodes Cobb, Esq., of Banbury, and Christopher James Thomas, Esq., of Drayton Lodge, Bristol; and they have this day elected Samuel Stone, Esq., of Leicester, as a Trustee, in the place of Mr. Grundy. The remaining vacancy will be filled up in December next.

The Trustees have to record their regret that Mr. James Yates, who has acted as Honorary Examiner in Greek Testament and Scripture History since the foundation of the Trust, has announced to them to-day that he will be unable to continue his valuable services. For these the Trustees have tendered him their best thanks, and they will immediately proceed to appoint a successor. There has been no other change in the office-bearers of the Trust since the date of the last Report.

One Scholarship is announced for competition in November next. The days of Examination will be the 25th, 26th, and 27th of November, and the subjects of examination are unchanged.

CHARLES J. MURCH, *Secretary.*

University Hall,
Gordon Square, London.